WILBERFORCE, CRANMER,

JEWELL, AND THE PRAYER BOOK,

ON

THE INCARNATION.

WASHINGTON:
GIDEON AND CO., PRINTERS.
1850.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

I. Introductory remarks.

II. Mr. Wilberforce's views of man's original state.

III. On the means of man's restoration.

IV. His views as to the regeneration of man; wherein it consists.

V. On our union with Christ's human nature by the sacraments.

VI. His views of education as grounded on baptismal regeneration.

VII. His objections to all other methods of union with Christ, than those set forth in his book.

VIII. On the means of continuing the union with Christ, begun in baptism.

IX. Extracts from Cranmer, on the foregoing subjects.

X. Extracts from Jewell.

XI. Extracts from Coverdale, Hutchinson, and Bradford.

XII. Extracts from King Edward's and Dean Nowell's catechisms.

XIII. Extracts from Tyndall and Peter Martyr.

XIV. The Protestant Confession, Bingham and ~~Ward.~~ Wall

XV. Doctrine of the Prayer Book.

XVI. Concluding remarks.

Wherever the name *Ward* occurs read "Wall."

Digitized by the Internet Archive
In 2017 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/wilberforcecranm00unse

I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

A few years since there was issued, by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society of New York, a tract, No. 171, containing the same views of the Incarnation and its extension by the sacrament of baptism, which are set forth more at large in the volumes of Mr. Wilberforce, recently published in England and republished in this country. A very able review by an anonymous writer exposed the extravangancies of that tract. Some of the friends of the society, which issued it, admitted its defects, but pleaded that the society must not be condemned, because it happened that some one wrote, and it published, one tract which contained a few silly and extravagant things. It was denied that such were the sentiments of any considerable number of persons in the Church. But now, after the lapse of a few years, two volumes containing the very same theories are published by the Rev. Mr. Hooker, of Philadelphia; concerning the first of which, (and the same is true perhaps of the second,) he has been known to say, that its sale was rapid and yielded a good compensation by comparison with that of the most interesting life and letters of Mr. Venn, which he had also previously published.(*a*) Several of our religious papers speak of these works in the highest terms, as containing the true Church doctrines. Metaphysical and unintelligible and unsupported by any experience of men, as many parts of these books are, deserving only of the playful

---

(*a*) A few years since a house in New York, which has published a number of works more or less imbued with Tractarianism, united in the publication and sale of that celebrated and most dangerous Roman Catholic book, Mœhler's Symbolism. On being remonstrated with on the subject, and urged to publish some work of an opposite character as an antidote, it replied that it would be happy so to do, if it could be made profitable; but that the "demand was for such works" as that complained of, and that booksellers must have reference to their interest. The fact that such books are still in demand, should make those who think them erroneous and mischievous, to exert themselves to have just views presented to the public, and false ones exposed, and not suffer themselves to be deceived by the cry, "that there is no danger, and that error will soon cure itself." Not so did the Apostles; the same may perhaps have spoken even in their day.

treatment they have received, yet is there much sufficiently plain to be understood and plausible enough to do mischief, and there are not a few liable to be led astray by them. They contain, indeed, the very essence of the Tractarian system in a somewhat modified form. The progress of that error is not yet arrested. It is with the doctrine of tract No. 171 as it was with the Oxford tracts at the General Convention of 1844. All disowned sympathy with them, and denied that there were any abettors of the same in the Church. Subsequent developments have proved the error of those statements; and the present favor showed to the doctrines of tract No. 171, when put forth by Mr. Wilberforce, admonishes us to be on our guard.(*b*) It is not proposed to attempt a regular examination of the doctrines of these books by the light of Scripture or of reason, but only by extracts from them, followed up by others on the same subject from high authorities, to show how different their teaching is. This comparison may lead some one, far more competent, to undertake an exposure of the errors of the system in a more effectual manner.(*c*)

Before entering on the proposed task of exhibiting what is deemed erroneous and dangerous in these books, by quotations from the same, we take pleasure in acknowledging what is good in them. Although the student of theology has read in ecclesiastical history and other books the accounts of the various disputes during the first five centuries as to the Trinity, the relation of the three persons thereof to each other and to men, and especially those concerning the incarnation of Christ, and the union of the two natures in order to his mediation between God and man, yet it is desirable to have the same from time to time referred to, as an antidote to all errors on those subjects. The writings of the Reformers contain frequent allusions to the early heresies on these points, for in their controversies with the Romanists and others they had much

---

(*b*) The views of Tract 171 and of Mr. Wilberforce are the same as those of Dr. Pusey in his work on Baptism. At the time that work was published in this country, it was generally considered so extravagant that few read it through, and most of those who did, said they could not understand it. One there was who said, that it was a work which would require some years to elapse before its merits would be appreciated. Should Mr. Wilberforce's book find many to approve it, the abovementioned opinion and prophecy will be fulfilled. Some there are who utterly condemned Dr. Pusey's sentiments at the time of their first publication by himself, who certainly approve them now when repeated by Mr. Wilberforce. We trust they will prove to be few.

(*c*) Let any one who wishes to see the difference between a great theological reasoner and a visionary Tractarian, read that masterpiece of logic and divinity, Bishop Butler's Analogy, especially his fifth chapter on the appointment of a Mediator and Redeemer.

occasion for the same. Mr. Wilberforce has brought to bear upon these points much research into fathers, heresiarchs, and schoolmen. Could he have stopped here, and not attempted to make every thing contribute to a certain theory, and to magnify one truth in theology, and one part of religion unduly at the expense of others, he would have rendered good service to the Church by a proper view of the unspeakable benefits of the incarnation and mediation of Christ; but as it is, there is too much reason to fear that his work will only help to sustain some of the most dangerous of the Tractarian errors—those which most nearly ally the system to the Romish perversion of Christianity. What these are, will be better seen as we proceed with the proposed extracts.(*d*)

(*d*) As it may assist the reader in understanding some things on the following pages, we will endeavor to state the author's theory. Instead of regarding the human family as consisting of a number of individuals, of the same nature, he regards it as an organized whole, having certain common qualities which he calls humanity or human nature, which is a thing, in an important sense, distinct from the individuals or persons in whom it exists. This human nature existed in Adam, as the head and representative of our race. In and through him it sinned and lost the favor of God. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the second Adam, entered into our line by taking this humanity, this organized whole into himself, and purifying it. As in his divine nature he was consubstantial or of one substance with the Father and Holy Spirit, so in his human nature he was consubstantial with this humanity, or organized whole of our race, so that he and it were one. The word consubstantiality has two meanings and uses. The first refers to a union by having one and the same substance. As such it is used when we speak of the Holy Trinity being of one substance, and indivisible. The second refers to the possession of the same kind of nature. In that sense all men are consubstantial with each other, being of the same nature, though different persons or individuals. Mr. Wilberforce uses it in the first sense, when he says that Christ's human nature was consubstantial with man's humanity, that it was of one and the same substance, since he had taken it, as a whole, "into himself." Thus, on page 149, he says: "Our salvation rests on the fact, that he who was consubstantial with the Father, is also consubstantial with his brethren." As his divine nature was of the same substance with the Father and Spirit, so his human nature is of the same substance with our humanity, at any rate as to all those whom he has taken into himself by baptism and reconstructed, and thus made one with him. As Adam transmitted his evil nature to all his posterity by the process of natural generation, so Christ diffuses his regenerate humanity through all his brethren, or takes them into himself by baptism, and continues to dispense the graces of his humanity by the Lord's Supper and other means. I will only hint at a few of the difficulties of this theory. It must, in the first place, be clearly proved that Adam's consubstantiality with all mankind was one of the first kind, an identity of substance in an organic body, and not merely the possession of the same nature and qualities, in order to draw from the comparison of St. Paul between the first and second Adam, the doctrine that Christ's human consubstantiality with his brethren whom he adopts, is of the same kind with his divine consubstantiality with the Father, viz., that they are of one and the

II.

MR. WILBERFORCE'S VIEWS OF MAN'S ORIGINAL STATE.

Mr. Wilberforce very properly commences the consideration of his subject with an inquiry as to the nature of man as coming from his Maker's hands. After some general remarks on the subject of human nature, or humanity in general, as distinguished from individual personality, which are neither very intelligible nor interesting to most readers, and the force of which is not so clearly felt, nor their object seen, until the work progresses, he gives us his view of man as first formed in the image of God. Those who are conversant with the writings of the Tractarians and of the Schoolmen, from whom they borrow their system, will at once recognise the identity between their views and Mr. Wilberforce's on the subject. The latter sometimes varies a little in his phraseology. It will be seen also, by a quotation from one of our homilies, how much he differs from those exponents of the Church's doctrine. The doctrine held by Tractarians is this, that though man is said to be made "in the likeness and after the image of God," still

---

same substance. That the whole human race was and is in Adam, in that sense and to that intent, cannot be established. But it is contended that when Christ calls the Church his body and himself the head, he thereby proves the identity, the consubstantiality of himself, and the Church in the fullest sense of those terms. If there were no figurative language in Scripture, this might suffice to help on the theory. But how often is a superior called the head of those under him, though not the very same person, and indeed differing much from them. The husband is called the head of the wife, but is she indeed a part of his very body, though having the same kind of body? If she is himself, why is he told to love her *as himself*. He is her head because of the authority he has over her. They are one flesh, because of their love to each other. Now like unto this is Christ's headship to his Church. He loves it, and by his spirit rules and sanctifies it. We do indeed become partakers of their divine nature, not by being made of one substance with the Father, or with either person of the Trinity, but by having some of the blessed qualities of the divine nature imparted to us. Our first parents had some of these qualities, being made after his image and likeness, though not having the very nature, essence, or substance of Deity. We may regain that image. We may be born again of the Spirit. We are told of being begotten of the Spirit through the Word. Mr. W. says that every infant is by baptism made consubstantial with Christ's regenerated humanity, receives through the waters of baptism a new birth into him, just as certainly as at his natural birth or conception, he received an evil nature through his parents from the first Adam. It is impossible to read what he and others of this school write, without receiving the impression that it is more a physical than spiritual process, that we are just as unconscious and as passive in the reception of our second nature from Christ's human nature, in the womb of baptism, as of our first nature from Adam, through our fathers, in the womb of our natural mothers.

there was wanting something, in order to his perfection, over and above this likeness and image of God. That something they call "a gift" "the presence of God," "a robe" "a superadded righteousness." It was this extra gift, this superadded righteousness, which was lost by the fall, and the want of which constitutes original sin in us—the original elements of our nature continuing the same. This lost gift, this withdrawn presence of God, is restored in baptism, and thus is original sin done away, and man restored to Adam's original condition.

Mr. Wilberforce, changing the language somewhat, says, p. 62, "He (that is, Adam, just made in the image of God) needed corroboration, not improvement. Yet whence was it that he had light for the guidance of his being? Can man who is a creature have light in himself? Is not the light of the moral as well as the physical world an emanation from the fountain of light? The very heathen had a conviction that man's nature could not be developed in its fullest proportions without such external aid: "*nemo sine aliquo afflatu divino vir magnus unquam fuit.*"(*e*) In Adam, therefore, there must have been superadded to those natural qualities which have been described, some supernatural gift for the guidance of the whole." Again, p. 67, he says: "It follows that the likeness of God must have been some divine presence superadded to primitive nature. This presence of a superior being was what gave perfection to that likeness of God, in which man was created," the likeness before being of course imperfect. On p. 70, he says: "Thus, then, we are led to the conclusion that original sin arises from the absence of that guiding light, the lack of which was followed by general confusion in man's inner nature. By this means was a door opened to that hostile power of evil, which had no place in man's original being." P. 71, he says: "But that it should have pleased God to withdraw the specific gift of guidance, which was originally conferred on Adam, is in itself not more inconsistent with the principles of justice, than the removal of any other endowment which man could not challenge as a right, though it had been mercifully bestowed upon him. All that is necessary is, that we should not so wholly identify the sinfulness of man with that loss of guidance on which it followed, as to destroy the individual responsibility of Adam's children." This theory

---

(*e*) If I mistake not, it was Plato who uttered this sentiment, and it should be remembered that he and many other of the philosophers held that a man was a fallen being and needed divine help to raise him up. He did not say that God made man imperfect at first, and soon had to mend or complete his work by some superaddition.

of a superadded righteousness or divine light or presence over and above the image and likeness of God, through the withdrawal of which the enemy took possession of man, is adopted to prepare the way for the doctrine of the restoration of this righteousness and presence to humanity in general by the incarnation in the womb of the virgin, and its further distribution through baptism to unconscious infants.(*f*) But before we come to this, we ask the reader to turn to his Bible and Prayer Book, and see if he can find any thing like the foregoing theory therein. The Bible says that God thus spoke and did—"Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." "So God created man in his own image." "And the Lord God made man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—See 1st and 2d chapter of Genesis. Thus formed, he pronounced him "very good." Nothing more is said. Now, let us hear what is said by the Church, in her homily on the nativity of Christ. "Among all the creatures that God made in the beginning of the world, most wonderful and excellent in their kind, there was none, as the Scripture beareth witness, to be compared almost in any point unto man; who, as well in body as in soul, exceeded all other, no less than the sun, in brightness and light, exceedeth every small and little star in the firmament. He was made according to the image and similitude of God; he was endued with all kinds of heavenly gifts; he had no spot of uncleanness in him; he was sound and perfect in all parts, both outwardly and inwardly; his reason was uncorrupt; his understanding was pure and good; his will was obedient and godly; he was made altogether like unto God in righteousness,

---

(*f*) Bishop Burnet, in his exposition of the article on original sin, refers to this as a Romish doctrine. "Those of the Church of Rome, as they believe that original sin is quite taken away in baptism, so finding that this corrupt disposition still remains in us, they do from thence conclude, that it is no part of original sin; but that it is the natural state in which Adam was made at first, only it is in us without the restraint and bridle of supernatural assistance, which was given to him, but lost by sin, and restored to us in baptism."

We have also the following fanciful interpretation of Scripture in order to the establishment of this doctrine, by one of the Fathers:

St. Ambrose, in speaking of the miracle of Elias in dividing the river Jordan, says: "But perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled in our time and the Apostle's time. For that returning of the river waters backward toward the spring head, which was caused by Elias when the river was divided (as the Scripture says Jordan was driven back) signifies the sacrament of the leaven of salvation, which was afterwards to be instituted; by which those infants that are baptized, are reformed back again from wickedness (or a wicked state) to the primitive state of their nature." Ward's Book on Baptism.

in holiness, in wisdom, in truth; to be short, in all kind of perfection." The homily, as to plan and subjects, is an epitome of Mr. Wilberforce's work. It can be read in a few moments. The reader is requested so to do before or after Mr. Wilberforce's work, or both. He will thus perceive what a change has taken place in the teachings of the Church, if those be the Churchmen, who claim so to be pre-eminently or exclusively. The homilies are faithful representations of the sentiments and preaching of the reformers on the same subject. All these were as well acquainted with the views of the schoolmen as Mr. Newman, Pusey, etc.; but we find nothing in them about this addition to the Divine image in man, which was lost by the fall and restored by means of the incarnation and baptism. They had deeper views of original sin, regarding it as an *infection of nature*—of the original nature of man—not merely a privation of a superadded righteousness, which leaves nature as it originally was, with the exception of some confusion in its operation, resulting from the withdrawal of this superadded light or presence. You look in vain through Mr. Wilberforce's work for such descriptions of man, in his fallen state, as you find in the homilies and writings of the reformers. On page 235, speaking of the perfection of Christ, as to his human nature, he says "but this perfection it had, not like Adam, from the *mere absence of guilt*, but from the presence of that Deity with which it was personally one;" so that, with Dr. Pusey, Newman, and others, he considers that the image and likeness of God, in which Adam was made, was "*the mere absence of guilt*" until God's presence, or a supernatural gift was added; and that being withdrawn, (why, we are not told,) this *mere absence* of guilt was turned into the actual presence of sin.

III.

ON THE MEANS OF MAN'S RESTORATION.

Having shown Mr. Wilberforce's views of what man was originally, and what he lost in the fall, we will consider what he regards as his restoration, and how it is effected. By the incarnation and union of the second person of the Trinity with humanity, the withdrawn presence of God is restored to it, which is thereby purified and exalted in the person of Jesus Christ. And now the renewal and salvation of each individual of the human race depends on their union with "the renewed and *renewing* humanity of Christ." How is this union to be effected? Mr. W. says, by the sacrament of baptism in the first place, and chiefly. By this, our human nature is grafted into the human nature of Christ, and

thus regenerated. The human nature which He took in the womb of the Virgin, consisting of the disordered and weakened, though not sinful, elements of our original nature, were by their union with the divine brought into order, exalted, and consecrated to be a source of regeneration to all others coming to Him through "*the waves of baptism.*" Mr. W. maintains that such outward elements are, on certain important accounts, more suitable channels of approach to the "*renewed and renewing humanity of Christ.*" He quotes Iræneus, page 120, as declaring that the elements are "the means of communicating that mysterious union whereby men are bound to the second, as by nature they were to the first, Adam." Also, on page 121, "that our flesh in the communion is nourished by the body and blood of our Lord, and becomes a part of Him." But before we exhibit his sentiments as to the sacraments, as the appointed means of effecting this purifying union with Christ, it will be best to state his general views as to the power imparted to Christ's human nature in this work of renewing each man's nature.

P. 222, he says, "The consecration of his, man's, nature made it the *fountain* from which grace should flow forth into his brethren." P. 229, "Through the union of Godhead and Manhood in his single person, there was infused into that humanity which he shared with us, such grace as sufficed for the whole generation of his kindred." P. 232, he speaks of Christians, as "fashioned into a new race, through the overflowing into their nature of that inexhaustible stream of grace which wells forth from the humanity of Christ, their head." Again, p. 233, "So that, when he declares himself to be the vine, he speaks of that human nature into which all christian men are ingrafted." In a note on this point, he quotes Hooker and St. Cyril, the latter as adduced by the former, though both of these expressly affirm, that it is the divine as well as human nature which is the "true vine" from which we draw nourishment. On p. 237, he says of Christ in his human nature, "he glorified every relation of man's life, and purified every portion of that material world which man had polluted." In a note to this passage, he quotes Bishop Andrews, as saying of Christ, "that he was not idle during all the nine months that he was in the womb, but then and there, he even eat out all that core of corruption that cleft to our nature and us, and made both us and it an unpleasing object in the sight of God. And what came of this? We that were abhorred, were by this means made beloved in him." If Bishop Andrews be not misunderstood, this is surely the doctrine of humanity being renewed in the lump, by the very fact of the incarnation; and how the doctrine of each child of Adam

being now born in sin can find place, we see not, nor how baptism can be needful for regeneration and pardon, that being done already for *our nature and for us.* In order to effect the life-giving union between us and the human nature of Christ, Mr. W. insists much on the necessity of the presence of that human nature, not excluding the *material* or *fleshly part of it,* though it is not present precisely as when he was on earth. Thus, p. 218–'19, "our Lord's presence on earth as mediator, is not *independent of his nature as man.*" "The presence of our mediator, though not *independent of his fleshly nature,* is brought about by the intervention of that divine nature." Again, p. 321. His manhood "has a real medium of presence through the Deity which is joined to it, so that it can be *at all places and with all persons, not figuratively, but in truth.*"(g) P. 209, "For since he is man as well as God,

---

(g) The following most difficult, doubtful, and hard to be understood passage from Hooker, which has puzzled and troubled the minds of so many of his admirers, is adduced by Mr. Wilberforce, in support of his more positive assertions of a yet more real bodily presence of Christ in the sacraments, by which he actually communicates his regenerate humanity to the partakers thereof, and thus makes the church parts of his real body, and partakers of his divine nature, whereby it becomes "the extension of the incarnation."

Hooker, 5th book, chap. 15, section 7th. "To conclude, we hold it in regard to the four alleged proofs, a most infallible truth, that Christ as man is not everywhere present. There are which think it as infallibly true that Christ is every where present as man, which, peradventure, in some sense may be well enough granted. This human substance, in itself naturally absent from the earth, his soul and body not on the earth, but in Heaven only. Yet, because this substance is inseparably joined to that personal word, which by his very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot *in itself* have universal presence, hath it *after a sort* by being *no where severed* from that which every where is present. For as much as that infinite word is not divisible into parts, it could not in part, but must needs be wholly incarnate, and consequently, wherever the word is, it hath with it manhood, else should the word be in part, somewhere, God only, and not man, which is impossible. For the *person of Christ is whole*, perfect God and perfect man wheresoever, although the parts of his manhood being finite, and his Deity infinite, we cannot say that the whole of Christ is simply everywhere, as we may say that this Deity is, and that his person is by force of Deity. For somewhat of the person of Christ is not every where in that sort, namely, his manhood, the *only conjunction* whereof with Deity is extended as far as Deity, the actual position restrained and tied to a certain place, yet presence by *way of conjunction* is in some sort presence." Might it not be asked, if our conjunction, one with another and with Christ our head, in one body is not *in some sort presence also*, and it therefore be argued that all of us are not only always present with each other, but with Christ, and thus have the attribute of omnipresence *in some sort*, or *after a manner?* However others might think this a strange question, Mr. Wilberforce and those agreeing with him as to the identity of the regenerate with Christ's human nature and their great exaltation cannot be surprised at it.

there must be a presence of the *inferior as well as higher nature.*" On p. 243, he says, that "The sacraments which are the means of binding us to the mystical body of Christ, derive their efficacy from *his body natural.*" P. 215, "And since it is as mediator, that he is present among men, this presence must plainly be through that human nature which he has taken as the means of union between Heaven and Earth." We shall only add on this subject, that Mr. W. repeatedly and positively affirms, in opposition to Cranmer and some of our best standard writers, that the promises of our Lord, as to his coming again, refer not to his sending the Holy Ghost to comfort, or to his second coming to judge the world, but to a return soon after, in his human nature, to abide with them. The promises "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," and "Lo, I am with you to the end of the world," refer also to the presence of the same human nature. See pp. 214–'15, and elsewhere.(*h*)

(*h*) Bishop Beveridge, on the fourth article which treats of the resurrection, says the body of Christ "was conveyed from earth to Heaven, so as to be as really and substantially afterwards in Heaven, and not on earth, as it was really and substantially before on earth and not in heaven. Neither did the human nature of Christ thus ascend from earth to heaven, presently to descend again from heaven to earth, but thither it ascended, and there it hath remained for above this sixteen hundred years together; and there it now, even this very moment, sitteth at the right hand of God, and there it will sit until his second coming to judgment." He repeats it, that "Though there, it was exalted above all other creatures whatsoever, it does and will remain, until, according to his promise, it shall come in like manner as it went." As to his gifts to men, Bishop Beveridge says, "It was here he bought them for us, but it is from thence he poureth them out upon us." But how is that done; by his human nature in some invisible form and aided by his spirit? Bishop B. says, "he enlightens our understandings by his spirit, and was faithful to the promise he had made them, when amongst them, to *be with them to the end of the world;* though not in *his person, yet by his spirit*, which he sent down to his Apostles upon earth, to furnish them with all graces whatsoever, requisite for that work they were to be engaged in." All such promises, Mr. W. claims from the ever present human nature of Christ, which returned invisibly to build up his church by spreading itself through the sacraments, and thus extending the incarnation. And instead of holding with Mr. W., that the mediation is still going on upon earth through the sacraments, which are sacrifices, and his ministers, who are a part of him, Bishop B. says, "which part of his priestly office was only to be performed within the veil in the holy of holies, even in Heaven; whither, had not Christ ascended, the Apostles could never have said "*we have an advocate with the father*, it being only in the court of Heaven that this one advocate was to plead our cause, as before he had shed his blood for us." So that "he hath the pledge of our flesh there, as we have the pledge of his spirit here."

IV.

HIS VIEWS AS TO THE REGENERATION OF MAN—WHEREIN IT CONSISTS.

There are some expressions in Mr. Wilberforce's book which seem to favor the doctrine held by some of this school, that by the very fact and at the moment of Christ's incarnation and conception in the womb of the Virgin, when he took humanity, human nature in general, into union with the Deity, there passed upon the human race an incipient regeneration; all men being then born anew in him, as all died in Adam. Certain it is that some so understand his words. As to those who undoubtedly hold this opinion, it will be difficult to exempt them from the charge of Pelagianism; for if all men be now regenerated, by the fact of Christ's incarnation, those who sin must do it by following Adam, who though born or made pure at the first, afterwards sinned. Mr. W. is cautious, if not doubtful and reserved, on this point. He speaks of regeneration being a "protracted process," which the whole life is not too long to complete, p. 330; of its having three stages, the first of which is "God's presence in Christ, the beginning of our regeneration," p. 350. "This new life had its commencement in the fact of the incarnation;" p. 331. So also in his work on Baptism, p. 41, he speaks of "the regeneration of collective manhood being wrought in the instant of our Lord's incarnation;" p. 332, "of an impulse which was bestowed in his incarnation." It is not wonderful, that some should attribute to him higher views of the efficacy of the very fact of the incarnation, than is consistent with other parts of his system, considering the language he often uses; or that some of his pupils should go beyond the teacher. His real sentiments may be learned from what follows: "What is meant by the work of man's regeneration? In its original form, this work assuredly was general, complete, and immediate, but its object was only that head of our race in whom manhood was purified, perfectly and at once, by the taking it into God." "But when this work is wrought in individual man, what is effected, is not the complete and instant change of the whole nature, but only the infusion of that divine seed of an higher humanity, by which their spiritual progress is commenced." P. 41, book on Baptism. Bearing in mind the distinction he makes between humanity in general and individuals, even the above does not absolutely exclude the idea of a kind of general incipient regeneration of human nature by the fact of the incarnation, but the following passages seem to be opposed to it. In setting forth his favorite doctrine, of all grace to men being centered in the humanity of Christ, he says, "For of grace, whereby is meant God's

love in action, we have but little comparatively in the Old Testament." So also "In the gospels we read of no general gift of grace to mankind." "Every mention of grace in the gospels, refers to its communication to the man Christ Jesus, the one mediator, in whom was concentered those gifts which he afterwards imparted to mankind." "The gospels then speak of grace, not as bestowed on humanity at large, but on the humanity of Christ." This grace also was bestowed gradually. "The child Jesus grew and the grace of God was upon him." "Though the humanity of the second Adam had by nature been free from spot, yet was suffering the appointed course through which it was perfected for the work of mediation." Pp. 28–'9, book on Baptism.

Mr. Wilberforce's view, then, of regeneration, as distributed through those who receive it, is, as he repeatedly expresses it, "The extension of the incarnation." (*i*) That, as Christ assumed a perfect human na-

---

(*i*) Mr. Wilberforce claims the Fathers as sustaining his system, and Bishop Taylor as using the very term, *extension of the incarnation*, which he adopts. A reviewer of Bishop Taylor's works has said, that they have more of the soul and body of poetry in them, than is to be found in very many volumes of English poetry. His highly figurative and extravagant style is well known. This is the best apology for his apparent contradiction. On what subject may he not be adduced by opposing parties? Some one, on being asked to what school of theology he belonged, replied, that he belonged to all, was a decided high churchman, low churchman, Calvinist, and Arminian. However Bishop Taylor may have used the term, I doubt not numerous passages might be found in his writings, setting forth the very opposite doctrine to that of Mr. Wilberforce. Thus in his Holy Dying, speaking of our sins being fully remitted by the blood of Christ, he says, "which forgiveness we obtain by faith and repentance, and therefore are not justified by the righteousness of works, but by the righteousness of faith, and we are preserved in the state of justification by the fruits of a living faith and timely repentance." Not a word about being regenerate and justified by union with Christ's body, although he is speaking of the incarnation and nativity and resurrection. See latter part of the volume. As to the Fathers, what writers, whether Romanist or Protestant, having any regard for their reputation, would undertake to use their works without often making large allowance for their Oriental and figurative style. The reformers, while constantly appealing to them, yet show by a comparison of one place with another in their books, that they must oftentimes be understood as writing, not in a literal, but figurative style. On this subject, it is probable they may have used strong language, and held erroneous views. The following method of accounting for it has been suggested: "Some of the Fathers having been Heathens themselves before their conversion, in their anxiety to draw off others from heathenism, were led to symbolize Christianity in a great measure to it by substituting some christian festival in the place of every idolatrous high day. To effect this, they took the principal events in Christ's history, such as the incarnation, circumcision, etc., making these feast days, and connecting some doctrine with each. With the incarnation they connected regeneration, because it had reference to the spiritual renovation of mankind. The practice of celebrating it being established, undue emphasis was soon laid upon it. Such, however, is not the case with our most sober and

ture in the womb of the Virgin, he communicates the same among the brethren by means of his humanity, just as Adam transmitted to them his evil nature, though by a different process. Human nature in each individual is thus exalted by union with the God-man, as the child born of the Virgin, and receiving her substance and nature, was exalted by union with the deity of Christ. It is thus, that the regenerate humanity of Christ becomes one with each regenerate person; that the Church is not only the body and Christ, the head thereof, but that as Mr. Wilberforce and others speak, the Church is Christ, and Christ the Church; the latter being only the "extension of the incarnation," as the branches when they grow are the enlargement of the vine. But how such language accords with that of Scripture and the Prayer Book, which speak of Christ loving the Church, and giving himself for it; praying for the Church; sanctifying the Church, etc., when he is the Church itself, and the Church is himself, the reader must judge. In the following passage, Mr. Wilberforce speaks of this union between Christ and his Church, which makes them interchangeable terms, "Our union with the manhood of Christ, or our participation in his presence, is brought about in our union with the Church, which is his body mystical. It is not, that one of these is a means or channel through which we approach the other, but since the two processes are identical, it is impossible to divide them. For

---

scriptural Protestant church, as will be seen hereafter. Well does Hooker observe, "whatsoever is spoken of God, or of things pertaining to God, otherwise than as the truth is, though it seems an honour, it is an injury." Especially does he say that this is the case with Scripture, when men would assign to it more than it claims. We look in vain through Scripture for any such expression or doctrine. Bishop Taylor, indeed, only calls it *an elegant opinion of the ancients*, evidently placing it among their lofty flights. We do not think it is quoted by Mr. Ward, in all the numerous and lengthy quotations from the Fathers, which we read in his two learned volumes on Baptism, wherein, seem to be collected every theory and surmise on the subject that was ever put forth. Mr. Ward refers to one instance of the disposition of Bishop Taylor to say and write strange things. He once wrote and published observations against infant baptism, and then answered them himself, but not until Dr. Hammond had put forth all his zeal and learning in reply, declaring that they contained the strongest arguments against the baptism of infants that had ever been put forth.

Bishop Taylor's figurative and poetical turn of mind, and style of writing, would doubtless have led him to approve the language of St. Cyprian, which, but for his qualifying phrase in some sense, might be quoted to prove the incarnation and extension of the Father also.

Speaking of the kiss bestowed on infants at their baptism, he says, "In kissing the infant, every one of us ought, out of devotion, to think of the fresh handiwork of God; for we do *in some sense kiss his hands*, in the person new formed, and but new born, when we embrace that which is of his making."

that which joins men to Christ's mystical body, the Church, is their union with his man's nature, and their means of union with his man's nature is bestowed in his Church or body mystical. This will become more evident, when it is shown that the sacraments, which are the means of binding us to the mystical body of Christ, derive their efficacy from the influence of his body natural." P. 243. On p. 269, he asks, "what room is there for discord between Christ and the Church, when the Church is *Christ himself manifest in his mystical body.*"

V.

OUR UNION WITH CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE, OR REGENERATION BY MEANS OF THE SACRAMENTS.

"The importance of sacraments rests on the incarnation of Christ, and on their being the means through which his man's nature is communicated to his brethren," see p. 313. "The reason, he says, why all the learned works on the sacraments fail to give confidence in their efficacy, is, that they do not take this view of it." St. Leo is quoted thus, "He that is received by Christ, and that receives Christ, is not the same after the laver of baptism that he was before it, because the body of the regenerate person becomes the flesh of the crucified one." (*j*) P.

(*j*) That we have not misrepresented Mr. Wilberforce, in saying that he holds these views of Dr. Pusey, we quote the following passages from the work of the latter on Baptism: "One then may define regeneration to be, that act whereby God takes us out of our relation to Adam and makes us actual members of his Son," "we have a portion of his life, or of him who is our life," "*not by any figure or likeness, but actually parts of the second Adam, as we were by nature of the first.*" He quotes St. Jerome as saying, that "we are taken into a participation of his substance." He quotes Irenœus, as "connecting our new birth with the Incarnation." He says, "no change of heart and affections comes up to the idea of this birth from above." "*It is not, as it were, a new birth, but it is an actual birth from above, or from God,* even as our blessed and incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born of him in the Virgin's womb." "Water is the womb of our new birth." "A commencement of life in Christ after baptism," is as impossible "as a commencement of physical life long after our natural birth." This he says, "is the point from which the two opposite systems which divide the Church diverge." See first part of his work on Holy Baptism. In his preface to the 2d vol. of Oxford tracts, we find the following sentiment, which Mr. Wilberforce often sets forth: "Hence we have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, actual spiritual contemplation, or what is called communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which, the Church and her sacraments are the ordained and visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen." Hence he says, it is now regarded as superstition to do what was done in primitive times, "administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and apparently insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives."

315. "So that sacraments differ from all other means of grace, in that, whereas other things result from union with Christ, they on the contrary conduct to it. Their pre-eminence depends on a real diversity between their office and that of any other things pertaining to the divine service, because through them, Christ, the head of mankind, joins himself to his brethren." P. 315–'16. "For thus it is, that all graces are communicated to mankind, flowing into them from the manhood which has been made the fountain of grace, through its personal oneness with the Deity." "What gives to baptism its especial character, is, that in that holy rite this process (of regeneration) is begun, for then are men joined by an heavenly agency unto Christ, that the life of their souls may from that day forth have its development." P. 332. "To suppose that such a work could commence from a spontaneous inherent action would be the very heresy of Pelagius. The flame requires to be kindled from without, that it may burn within. There must be an external action, to which the inward movement must respond. Renovation must have its root in regeneration. There must be a gift antecedent to our efforts. This gift is that first union with Christ, whereon all communication of graces from him to us depends. On this beginning depends the whole system of the christian life. And this heavenly impulse is expressly declared in scripture to be extended to us in baptism." Again, p. 340, "It were contrary to the whole theory of the gospel to assume the existence in man of christian graces, antecedently to their participating in the mediation of Christ." "The existence therefore of an external and objective mean, whereby we may be in the first instance united to Christ, is the very basis of subsequent obedience." On p. 256, the same is thus set forth, "The custom, therefore, of putting inward acts of faith and love in place of these external means whereby Christ vouchsafes to join man to his manhood, is in reality to make these the channels of mediation instead of him." Again, p. 255, "He must actually stretch forth the hand of his humanity towards us, before we can effectually stretch forth the hand of faith towards him." That is, he must join himself to us by the sacraments, instead of using our natural faculties as means of union. He must use "media, which are beside and foreign to nature." (*k*)

(*k*) Bishop Beveridge, on the 2d article, says, "It was not any human *person* in particular, but the human nature in general, he assumed into his divine person, so that as the whole nature sinned in Adam, so did the whole nature suffer for sin in Christ." Hence he argues, that each particular person *repenting and believing* will be accepted by him and reconciled to the Father. Bishop Beveridge directs us at once to his death as the great object of his coming in the flesh. Very different is his language from Mr. W's.

VI.

HIS VIEWS OF EDUCATION AS GROUNDED ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION, OR INCORPORATION INTO THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST.

P. 334, "But all that is asserted of baptism is, that since it is our first means of union with the manhood of Christ, the basis of our spiritual growth must be laid in it." P. 335, "Neither is there any reason why men should ground their disbelief in the reality of baptism, on the small results which they see it effect. The very principle of faith is to admit that which sense does not discern: *blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed.* And it is hard to say how much of the inefficacy of baptism is due to the popular unbelief, which prevents men from doing justice to it. When children are not instructed in the nature of the gift they have received, we cannot wonder if it be inoperative." Its results might be very different if they were accustomed to expect those effects, which St. Cyprian assures us, resulted from his own baptism He speaks of his former difficulties; and how powerless he felt to escape those evil habits, which adhered to his nature: but he says, "after that the stain of former sins being washed away through the water of the new birth, a light from above infused itself into my acquitted and purified bosom; and after that, through a spirit drawn from above, a new birth had made me a new man—what was doubtful, began immediately in a wonderful manner to receive confirmation; what was shut to be opened, what was dark to be enlightened, what was impossible to be attainable." Now, it should be remembered, that St. Cyprian was an adult when he was baptized, and if he came to it as ignorant, as much under the power of sinful habits, as unable to do any thing aright, as he and some other of the Fathers seem to have represented themselves, then our Church demands too much of knowledge, and faith, and holiness, in order to the baptism of an adult. There are in this day, many sincere and pious persons who ask for adult baptism, and receive it in the most scriptural and solemn manner; but which of them declare, that their experience of its wonder working effects at the time, and by the act, accords with such as has been described? But even if it were so, can we affirm the same of infants? Mr. Wilberforce is so fearful of any interference or co-operation with the waters of baptism in conveying this grace of union with Christ's humanity, and so anxious to make the new birth independent of any action on the part of man, that he is evidently afraid of the opinion, that the piety and faith of parents has any thing to do with effectual use of baptism. Why the Church should

have required faith in sponsors, and have provided so many prayers for the occasion in the midst of the congregation, if they be of no avail, contribute nothing under God to the efficacy of baptism, is hard to be understood. Besides other remarks in his two volumes, we find on p. 359, of his work on the Incarnation, the following: "Its virtue does not depend on the prayers of the sponsors, whose attendance in private baptism is not required, but on the life of that portion of Christ's Church into which they are admitted; for no man, however faithful, can obtain salvation for others through the merit of their prayers; 'no man can deliver his brother,' but the merits of Christ are large enough to extend *saving efficacy through every living portion of His mystical body*," that is, saving grace, or efficacy, is lodged in the Church itself, which is quite consistent with the doctrine that Christ is the Church, and the Church is Christ. According to this, the merits of Christ extend saving efficacy to Christ himself. It would seem, then, that the efficacy of baptism, though not affected by the prayers of pious parents or others, results from the life of that portion of Christ's body, the piety of that branch of the Church into which it is baptized. How many questions might be raised on this point? For instance, if a branch of the Church ever becomes dead, then baptism into it must be null and void, no saving efficacy being there. On p. 121, work on Baptism, we have the following assertion: "For in truth, christian education is based entirely on the belief in baptismal grace. It does not appear how christian education can be generally given on any other hypothesis without implying the error of Pelagianism?"

And is it, indeed, Pelagianism—is it a belief that our children are born, as Adam was made, innocent, and that they have natural faculties and powers sufficient for salvation, when pious parents look up to God and pray for his sanctifying grace on them as poor sinful creatures, and teach them at the earliest dawn of reason that word in which we are told men are born again by the spirit? Is it Pelagianism to think that the effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous may avail for them with Heaven? Do we only cease to be Pelagians when we believe that God honors water for the purpose of this sanctification, when used by the minister for the purpose, and will not honor faith and prayer and His holy word, though all of them are His gifts? Do not men use the water, bread, and wine, as well as put forth the exercise of their minds in faith and prayer? Nay, do not the Church and Scripture require the word, faith, prayer, penitence, to accompany the water? Why accompany them, if the exercise of the same be a proud and presumptuous interference with the grace of

God? Not only our faculties, but the pious exercise of them in faith, penitence, and love, are as much God's gifts, as the water, bread, and wine, and why may he not use them as mediums of his grace?(*l*) But let us appeal to facts and history on this subject, and see whether they will sustain the theory. It is affirmed of the belief that, in the baptism of infants, the first Adam is expelled and the second and perfect Adam is introduced, that it is the true principle of Christian education; and that the want of it is the reason why the baptismal grace is not preserved, the new man kept alive and nourished up to the stature of the fulness of the perfect man in Christ. What does history testify on this point?

It is a well known fact that, for some centuries of the early Church, such was the belief in the fact of a spiritual influence over the minds of unconscious infants by means of sacraments, that not only was baptism, but confirmation and the eucharist administered to them immediately after their birth. They were supposed to receive the grace of all these ordinances, and thus be most effectually united to Christ. Presenting no hostile barriers of unbelief and impiety to the grace of God through these ordinances, they were all blessed with the graces thereof. What a foundation was here laid for christian education by those who believed as they did, that such grace was imparted! How, then, did it happen that the Church was, during all that time, becoming more and more corrupt, until it ended in the Romish Anti-Christ and Mahometan apostacy? The Romish Church, also, has ever since held the same doctrine, though discarding the use of infant communion. And are the children of Romanists so much better than others, and that whole communion so much purer, in consequence of such belief? Again, in the second, and purer, and very wide spread reformation under Archbishop Laud, as some speak even now, there was a revival of this belief in a thorough infant regeneration and union with Christ's humanity as the basis of christian education, and what were the effects of it? It certainly did not prevent a

(*l*) St. Austin says: "It is piously and truly believed that the faith of those by whom the child is offered to be consecrated profits the child And this, the most sound authority of the Church, doth command, that hence every one may judge how profitable his own faith will be to himself, when even another person's faith is useful for the advantage of those that as yet have none of their own." Again: "For infants are offered for the receiving of the spiritual grace, not so much by those in whose hands they are brought, (though by those, too, if they be good and faithful Christians,) as by the whole congregation of saints and faithful men. For they are rightly said to be offered by all those whose desire it is that they should be offered, and by whose holy and united charity they are assisted towards the communication of the Holy Spirit."

most extensive and bloody revolution, which ended in the dissolute manners and infidel principles of the reigns of Charles II and James II.

It is said, in reply to these historical objections or facts, that the belief was not carried into practice; Christian education has never been duly attended to on this basis.

But what must we think of a theory which has been so extensively held for at least fifteen centuries by a large portion of Christendom, and one, too, of so important a character, which has yet never been put in practice, or so partially as to produce very trivial results? Either it was not really believed, or else there was something false and rotten about it, which rendered it useless, or worse than useless. Perhaps we might suggest another reason, viz., that those who really believed that there was so much done for their children in baptism, could not bring themselves to the practical conviction that as much was necessary afterwards; or else, building on a false foundation, they reared a superstructure which, like the house built upon the sand, was soon swept away. The writers of this school deal very much in positive assertion of the almost invariable efficacy of their system, if men could only be gotten to try it, and inveigh bitterly against those who propose to conduct religious education on a different principle, charging them with denying the possibility of early piety, and of course affirming the utter uselessness of the effort, and therefore neglecting such effort. A more unfounded charge could not well be made. The history of the reformation from the first contradicts it. While renouncing the Romish theory of an extirpation by baptism of the root and branch of original sin, and affirming that it still remained in all, to be the object of abhorrence, and to be assailed by all the means appointed of Heaven, they set themselves to the task of religious education as one of the most effective agencies for subduing the old man of sin, and raising up the new man. Let all the catechisms which were put forth by all the Protestant churches of Europe testify to this. What numbers for the youth of every age and class were issued by individuals, convocations, bishops, and civil rulers! What continued and increasing numbers of them have been issued ever since!

In opposition to the unfounded assertion that those professing what are called evangelical principles are particularly opposed to the belief of early piety, and of course to the use of the means for promoting it, we appeal to the history of the last fifty or sixty years. During this period the Evangelical clergy and laity of England have been distinguished by nothing more than their attention to the religious instruction of children, grounded, not on their certain belief of a thorough moral regeneration by

baptism, but on their capability of very early piety, by God's blessing, on a religious education. Who of this school was it that wrote the first tracts for children and the poor, and devoted so much time and labor to Sunday schools? Let the history of Mrs. Hannah More and her sisters answer this. Who, of all that have written on religious education, whether for the Prince or the Peasant, have surpassed or equalled Mrs. Hannah More? And where was the venerated father of Mr. W. himself to be found, on each Sabbath morning after the arduous parliamentary labors of the week? At the side of some pauper children of London, or the vicinity, instructing them in the first principles of religion. And what shall we say of the unwearied efforts of that father for the early piety of his own children, and of his remarkable success? Let his biography, prepared by his own sons, inform us. All of his sons are in the ministry, and one of them in the highest order thereof. Did that father conduct their religious education on the only true principle, as set forth by one of the sons in the books we are considering? Let his letters, and especially that Heaven blest work, his "Practical view of Christianity," answer the question. Never were the principles of father and son more variant from each other than as seen in that noble work, and the volumes before us. The effect of the examples of such persons as Mrs. More and William Wilberforce, and an host beside of that day and since, was seen and felt then, and has been ever since. So far from religious education having been decried as useless, even impious, in its principles, or interfering with God's method of converting souls, we are persuaded that the last fifty years have been marked by more successful efforts for the promoting of early piety than any preceding them from the first establishment of Christianity. Let us only consider how many catechisms, hymns, biographies, of those who have become pious at a very early age, have been put forth. Let us only consider the hundreds and thousands of the best of books which have been put forth by the various societies in our own and other lands, and what constant use is made of them in the family and the Sunday school, among all denominations of Christians, and what happy results flow from them according to general acknowledgment. But on what principle are these books written and used? Is it on the theory of Mr. Wilberforce and the Tractarians? But few, comparatively, thank God, have as yet been prepared on that platform, though the number we fear is increasing in our Church. Should it be acted on to any extent, we may look for the same results as were seen in the dark ages, and may be seen now in the Romish Church.

VII.

MR. WILBERFORCE'S OBJECTIONS TO ALL OTHER METHODS OF FORMING AN UNION WITH CHRIST, EXCEPT THAT OF THE SACRAMENTS.

On page 256 he thus writes: "The custom, therefore, of putting inward acts of faith and love in place of those external means whereby Christ vouchsafes to join men to his manhood, is in reality to make these the channels of mediation instead of Him; it is to set up idols in our hearts, and thank them for our deliverance from the house of bondage." On page 258—"If men say that what they trust to is not their own spirit, but something bestowed upon them by God, yet still it is something within themselves—something 'which, if Heaven gave it, may be termed their own?' For they look to some chain of intercourse which, starting from themselves, communicates directly with the Most High. What is this, in fact, but to fall back on those endowments of man's spirit which he has by creation—upon the natural powers of the soul—and thus to pass by the Mediator in our approach to God?" Page 269—"And, therefore, to maintain that the outward means of grace, whereby we are united to the manhood of Christ, are not less necessary than those emotions which have their seat within, is not to put the Church instead of Christ, but to protest against men putting themselves in the place of their Redeemer." On page 328–'9—"For, when spiritual presence is spoken of, there are two notions which may suggest themselves. Such presence may either be supposed to result from the action of the mind, which receives an impression, or from the action of the Being which produces it." He asserts that the presence of Christ's human nature in the sacraments is of the second sort; that the human nature in Christ has "life in itself," which renders it a source of life to others; that on the other principle "the life-giving principle of holiness must have its seat, not in Christ, but in our own minds; and therefore, in effect, that we should be our own saviours." Again, in his work on Baptism, page 136—"To refer, therefore, to these natural channels of communion with God, as something which may be substituted in place of that sacramental fellowship whereby He communicates His nature, is the very error of the Pelagians, because it is to substitute the efficacy of nature for the efficacy of grace."

Mr. Wilberforce frequently charges those who differ from him in their estimate of the comparative value of sacraments as means of grace, with Rationalism, Pelagianism, Sabellianism, and other heresies of ancient

and modern times.(*m*) We think, however, that a moment's consideration of his charges will show how he first entirely misrepresents their sentiment, and then calls them by such offensive and unjust names.

We shall now adduce a concession of his own, which will lead us into a plain and easy way of exposing the injustice of his charges. On page 340 of his work on the Incarnation, speaking against any other means of our first union with Christ, except Baptism, he says, "But it may be objected, are not the heathen exhorted to prayer as a preliminary to baptism. They doubtless are, and in their case the appeal rests upon that universal presence of the Word (second person of the Trinity) by which every man in a measure is enlightened. Unless there were some remnant of that original influence which the Word exercised over his creatures, no basis could exist for their conversion, but their prayers and efforts are not built upon that union of Christ, which is the principle assumed in christian education." He elsewhere, in speaking of Jews and Gentiles, and some in christian lands, represents them as enjoying "the overflowings of grace," which break over the channels appointed of God, as though the river of God had swelled beyond his design. Tract 171 calls them the "stray visitation of the Holy Ghost," as though the Holy Ghost had lost the right path. On page 390, Mr. W. also acknowledges that "love, faith, and obedience are found in large measures among those who have never enjoyed the advantage of being joined to Christ through the sacraments of his grace; that their virtues often put

---

(*m*) Mr. Wilberforce repeatedly charges with Pelagianism those who cannot agree with him in his views, saying that Pelagians denied the mediation of Christ, and that they do practically the same thing. Now, in looking over the accounts given us by Mosheim, Bishop Beveridge, Burnet, Mr. Ward, and others of Pelagianism, we do not find that he denies the divinity or redemption of Christ, though he affirms that his atonement is not required for original sin, but only for actual sins. St. Austin does, indeed, charge him, as a consequence of his doctrine, with virtually rendering the atonement needless, because he denied original sin, which Pelagians disavowed, affirming that Christ's death was absolutely necessary to our redemption. After a considerable time, when Pelagianism was almost extirpated, himself dead, and only a little handful of his excommunicated followers left, they did unite themselves to some other heretical sect which denied His mediation. But is it becoming in Mr. Wilberforce thus to stigmatize as Pelagians those who cannot agree with him that God prefers to use material instruments as the channels of His grace, to the higher faculties of our spiritual nature, which are also His workmanship, as well as water, bread, and wine? Might we not with more justice retort the charge on him, and say, that if children at their birth, in a moment, by baptism, are restored to Adam's condition, then original sin in them must henceforth "stand in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk." See 9th article of our Church.

to shame the vices of those who, by adoption, are members of Christ's body; and also that their excellencies must be the result of divine grace, because they are professedly referred to Christ and his Holy Spirit." "Doubtless these graces flow from that one Mediator who is expressly declared in holy writ to be the one only name through whom comes salvation." "Many reasons may exist, beyond the reach of our short-sighted vision, why God may have seen fit to provide an appointed means of union with Christ, with which, in *cases innumerable*, it may please him to dispense." How these concessions can be reconciled to some passages quoted in this review, and others like them in his books, we leave the reader to determine. Such persons though saved, must, we presume, be saved without being united to the human nature of Christ by sacramental grace. He must admit that all the heathen that have been or will be converted to God, and all adults coming to baptism, must be by God's assistance possessed of a spirit of prayer, and have faith and penitence before they are united to Christ's humanity; and that some who are never baptized, even innumerable persons, are saved. Now, all these must have exercised their natural faculties of mind in seeking God's grace. Through that channel some grace must have descended, even the spirit of prayer, faith, penitence, love. What, then, becomes of all Mr. Wilberforce's assertions about the substitution of our thoughts and feelings and emotions, for God's work through the sacraments? The truth is, that Christians, whether before or after Baptism, or at the time, use their mental faculties not as a substitute for God's grace, but as a means of obtaining it. They pray, they put forth acts of faith and penitence, which God himself enables them to do, in order to receive more grace, not to supersede it, as Mr. W. most improperly insinuates. They do not institute a comparison between the Word, faith, prayer, and the sacraments as means of grace, except when such as Mr. W. would monopolize all grace, or demand an undue portion, for sacraments to the injury of all other. Nay, Protestants have always held that the Word, faith, and penitence, were necessary parts of the sacraments, and on that account, as well as because they were special ordinances of God, have honored them. The real dispute is this: whether the grace of God is more magnified by being received through the outward elements of water, bread, and wine, or through the exercise of our minds on the Word, in faith and prayer. The advocates of the former say we are in greater danger of ascribing it to ourselves when it comes through our own minds, than when it comes through external signs, and especially when given to unconscious infancy; that there is no natural tendency in

these things to produce a change, so that it must needs be of grace, and that therefore God chooses this mode, that it might evidently be all of grace. But might not God have improved on this plan? Might he not have chosen some most unclean thing instead of water, and some most poisonous thing instead of bread and wine, to be the means of grace, lest the purity of water, and the refreshing and strengthening influence of bread and wine, might awaken certain associations in the mind, and thus produce activity in it—a thing much dreaded by Mr. Wilberforce. Nay, might not God and his church have improved on it still further, and instead of bestowing it only on infants and believing adults, have ordained that the most abandoned profligates should be taken and washed with water and fed with bread and wine, and thus reformed, so as to make it evident that all was of grace. Nay, would not grace be more magnified on the plan of the Universalists, who hold that all men are saved without any regeneration. The church of Rome has approximated to one of the above plans, by requiring of adults that they shall only not be infidels and despisers of God. They wish only a blank sheet, a passive, inactive substance on which the sacraments may set their seal, and make their impression. But is it not most reasonable that God, in conferring his grace on rational, though sinful beings, should deal with them as such, and not as though they were mere matter to be acted on by material instruments. That such is the case, and that Mr. Wilberforce has brought a most unjust accusation against those who differ from him, in charging them with substituting their own thoughts and feelings for Christ's mediation, I adduce the 10th article of our church, and some remarks of Bishop Beveridge on the same.

ART. 10.—OF FREE WILL.

"The condition of man after the fall of *Adam* is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith, and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will." On which Bishop Beveridge remarks, "None can come by faith to God the Son, but he that is drawn by the grace of God the Father." "Both the grace we desire and the desire of grace proceeds from him." "For it is he that worketh in me both to will and to do." "It is he *that prevents us, that we may have a good will.*" He quotes Augustine as saying, "Neither doth a man begin to be converted or changed from evil to good by the beginnings of faith, unless the free and undeserved mercy of God work it in him." He

quotes Maxentius as saying, "Those things that belong to eternal life, we can neither think, nor will, nor desire, nor perform, but only by the influence and inward working of the Holy Ghost, which is also the spirit of Christ." He quotes Fulgentius as saying, "We have not, therefore, received the spirit of God, because we do believe, but that we may believe." He quotes the second Council of Orange, "If any man say that mercy is conferred by God upon us believing, willing, desiring, endeavoring, laboring, watching, studying, asking, seeking, knocking, without the grace of God, but doth not confess that it is only by the influence and inspiration of the Holy Ghost into us that we believe, will, &c., he resisteth the apostle who says 'What has thou that thou hast not received.'"

All those who truly draw nigh to God, that he may draw nigh to them, do it by the help of that Spirit which helpeth the infirmities of men. All who use the Word as a means of grace, ask the help of that Spirit which dictated it. As for expecting salvation without any co-operation on our part, or our friends, lest it should not be all of grace, it is a perfect absurdity. Some person must bring the child to baptism; the minister must apply the water, use the appointed words; the congregation join in the prayer. All these are some things done by man, and why not the faith and prayer of parents be admitted. To exclude man altogether, God should send angels to take the little ones or the heathen and baptize them; but then the angels might rob God of some of the glory, on the principles of Tractarianism. Extremes do indeed touch each other. Ultra Calvinists and Antinomians say that the doctrine of absolute decrees understood in its highest sense, and which makes man as passive as possible, excluding him from any co-operation with God, is the only one which acknowledges free grace. Mr. Wilberforce and his party are so fearful of the activity of man's mind being at all engaged with God's grace, that they continually affirm it to be a fact that God selects unconscious infancy as the time of his working, and a material element as his instrument, not only in preference to other, but exclusively, for the first and great union with Christ. Other transformations are exceptions, the overflowings of grace, and we see not but they must differ very much in kind also.(*n*)

(*n*) A man may be sick and feel the need of a physican and of medicine, without which he would die, and may send for the physician and take the medicine and be healed. In order that we may be thus healed, it is not necessary that we should be in an unconscious stupor, or asleep, and that others send for the physician and pour the medi-

If it be charged upon the system which holds that God uses the mental faculties, which he has given to rational beings, as means through which his grace is dispensed, that the same ministers to pride and self-righteousness, and detracts from the freedom of grace, might it not be with more force objected to the system which affirms that material elements are preferred by God, that the latter is a tempting of him by expecting his great grace through such a medium? Let the water, the Word, prayer, faith, and the acts of obedience to a command of God, be all duly united, and then, indeed, we can readily understand how God can make them all, in their way, contribute to the desired end.

VIII.

ON THE MEANS OF CONTINUING THAT UNION WITH CHRIST, WHICH IS FIRST EFFECTED BY BAPTISM.

Page 250. "All the ordinances of the church, its hallowed things, places, and persons, its worship and sacraments, are a series of instruments whereby the sanctified manhood of the Mediator diffuses itself as a life-giving seed through the mass of humanity." Thus does he *continue* to effect that work through his man's nature, which he avowed to be the very object of his earthly being. "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth." In consistency with this declaration he speaks of *common worship, of daily*

---

eine into our mouths, that it may be true that we do not heal ourselves. Neither is it necessary that baptism or the Lord's Supper be administered to adults when asleep, or in an unconscious state, in order to its effect being of grace, as some have thought who even believed that the bread and wine laid on the breast of a dead person was of some virtue. Even as to infants coming to baptism there was a diversity of opinion among some of the Fathers and Reformers, whether there may not be either actual faith, or the habit or seed of faith. Our Church certainly ascribes the efficacy of baptism to the virtues of prayer. It deserves to be noted that the Fathers dwell upon the fact, that God is moved to grant his grace and forgiveness to little children in baptism, not to show that it is and must be of grace only, as they can then do nothing, but because it is Adam's sin that is washed away, and not their own. They say it is so much easier and more probable that God would forgive little children the sin of Adam, or original sin, which they inherit of necessity, though they cannot repent and believe, than to forgive the *actual sins* of an adult, which are his own, even upon his faith and repentance. Thus, St. Cyprian, "who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own, but other's sins that are forgiven him." He says, "that, by their weeping and wailing at their first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion."

services, frequent communions, ministers of apostolic succession, priestly offerings and sacrifices under the Gospel, as under the law, as being ministerial interventions between us and heaven. If it be asked, what does he say of private prayer and the use of God's Word in this connection, we reply that he does indeed speak of them, but whether as the Scriptures do, or the reformers and the standards of our Church do, let the reader judge. As to the Jews he says, p. 278, "Their ardent aspirations to God were grounded always on that peculiar privilege of approach which had its central and consecrating point in their national ritual" When abroad "their thoughts travelled to their native land; they associated themselves in spirit to that national worship which God had made the channel of heavenly gifts, and thus they claimed their part in the collective privilege of the nation." Page 279–'80, "The single prayers which were offered by the pious Jew, in the solitary temple of his heart, ascended to God, *because*, through the privilege of the nation, heaven and earth were bound together." Much that is said on the subject of prayer is just. The only objection is, that through his desire to magnify unduly public prayer as binding us all together, when offered up through the medium of our Lord's intercession, in his human nature, he seems to charge others with holding the merit of private prayer without the intercession of Christ. Throughout his book he often raises up a man of straw, and then furiously assaults it as an heretic. As to the use of God's revealed word, as read or preached, for the purpose of conversion or edification, as the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and the fathers and reformers teach, Mr. Wilberforce speaks in an unknown tongue to us. On page 235 he says, "So much he himself tells us respecting his human nature, declaring that he purified it, that it might be a fit source of grace for all men; "for their sakes I purify myself, that they also might be purified through the truth." "And this sanctifying truth is no other than that divine being, who applies the virtue of his own manhood to his servants: *sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth.*" So that when Christ prays that God would sanctify his saints through the truth, saying thy word is truth, he means that God would sanctify them by his manhood or human nature—the word of God and Christ's body being convertible terms. On page 367 he expressly says, that the Word by which believers are born again is Christ. "For why should he be called the *Word*, save with a view of showing how intimate is the relation between those written oracles in which God's will is declared to us, and that personal word which abideth in us. Thus do we learn that the Word by which believers are "*born again*," is iden-

tical with that which by the Gospel is preached. In what he says about the Word, he makes a distinction between the written and the living word. By the latter we are born again in baptism and nourished in the eucharist. The former is not without its uses for contemplation and guidance, but the former must be *its* guiding light, and this light is furnished through *the human nature of Christ to his body the Church.* The one he calls the imparted word, the other the engrafted word. Page 387: "The imparted objective truth of the word written, requires the engrafted subjective influence of the living word as its expositor." Page 388: "The word written implies the living word as its constant correlative; the one receives, applies, interprets the other." This teaching he says "dwells through grace in the body of those who are united to him." Page 389: "It must needs flow in the channel of those blessings which the Mediator has brought down from heaven, and its appointed course, therefore, will be through the body mystical, which he unites to him only through the efficacy of his body natural"—that is, through union with the body of Christ by means of baptism, in the first place, we obtain this living word, which is the *engrafted word,* that is able to save our souls, and which has ever been the true, unerring guide to the Church. Thus, on page 389: "Such an endowment was always asserted for that company of faithful men, to whom was 'revealed the wisdom of God in a mystery,' and in whose name the apostle asserts 'we have the mind of Christ.'" To the "collective members of Christ's Church," whose "natural powers are elevated by connection with that supernatural system through which they participate in Christ," is the gift of understanding the Scriptures. Therefore he says the Church has never been careful to examine into the theories of inspiration, and the meaning of particular expressions of Scripture. Her great writers were "contented with believing Scripture to be God's imparted word," and "looked to a divine interpretation of its sacred words." Much does Mr. Wilberforce say on this particular subject, and on others which, after reading again and again, we confess ourselves unable to understand. We have endeavored to represent fairly what we think that we may *perhaps* understand.

One thing is most evident, that the fixed idea is ever upon him—that in order to make the human nature of Christ *the source, the overflowing source, of all good gifts to man, and the sacraments, the means of their conveyance, to identify Christians in body and soul with the man Christ Jesus, so as to make the Church a mere extension or enlargement of Christ himself,* he has used language to which the readers of Scripture and the

Prayer Book are entirely unused, and which appear to them either unintelligible, or as setting forth false doctrine. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, though so earnestly contended for in some places, seems to be forgotten in others, by the neglect to assign to them their several offices, and our communion with them; while the humanity of Christ is the "all and all."(o) This, however, is very important to the establishment of the sacramental system in the exaggerated form in which it is presented by himself and his Tractarian associates.

IX.

EXTRACTS FROM CRANMER, SHOWING THE DIFFERENCE OF HIS LANGUAGE AND SENTIMENTS ON THE FOREGOING SUBJECTS FROM THOSE OF MR. WILBERFORCE AND THE TRACTARIANS.

In the preface to his work on the Sacraments, published in 1550, in answer to Gardiner, the popish bishop, he warns against the misunderstanding of certain terms which he sometimes uses in relation to the presence of Christ in the sacraments, declaring that he uses them "as the old authors do"—that is, only of his spiritual presence in those that "worthily receive the same." Moreover, he declares that Christ is no more present in the worthy receiver of the Lord's Supper than of Baptism; and that *at all times*, "whensoever in the Scripture it is said that Christ, God, or the Holy Ghost is in any man, the same is understood spiritually, by grace."

On page 226 he also refers to some expressions in a chatechism translated and set forth by him, which had been misunderstood. In that he had quoted certain words of Chrysostom, who spoke of seeing, tasting, and feeling Christ with bodily eyes, mouth, and hands, but shows that neither he nor Chrysostom meant any thing else than a spiritual perception of Christ with the mind.

On page 56 Cranmer defends the book of Common Prayer against the charge made by Gardiner, that it taught the real presence of Christ's

---

(o) P. 223, he quotes Dr. Jackson as saying: "Although the Holy Ghost or Third Person in the Trinity doth immediately and by personal propriety work faith and other spiritual graces in our souls, yet doth he not by these spiritual graces unite our souls or spirits immediately with himself, but unto Christ's human nature." Considering the many passages of scripture which speak of the intimate union between the souls and bodies of the faithful and the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in them, is it not more than Dr. Jackson, Mr. W., or any other man can do, to affirm the above, and thus undertake to determine what the spirit does?

body in the Supper. "And yet the book of Common Prayer neither useth any such speech, nor giveth any such doctrine, nor I in no point improve that godly book, nor vary from it. But yet glad am I to hear that the said book liketh you so well, as no man can mislike it, that hath any godliness in him, joined with knowledge." Here we find Cranmer, just after the framing of this book, defending it against any popish interpretation. Those who now too readily listen to the charge, not only of an intentional use of popish language, but of the retaining some popish doctrine in the Prayer Book, would do well to examine Cranmer's defence and explanation of it, in this controversy with Gardiner. The following extracts will be of some use in settling the question, as to the interpretation of the Prayer Book. As a specimen of the liability of some expressions of Cranmer, and of the reformers generally, to be misunderstood and perverted, when separated from the explanations to be found elsewhere in their writings, I present the following, to be found on p. 25: In arguing with the Papists, who maintain that Christ's body and blood are only received in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Cranmer and his associates always affirm, that it is also and equally, and in like manner, received in baptism and by faith. Thus does he speak, "And where you say that in baptism we receive the spirit of Christ, in the sacrament of his body and blood we receive his very flesh and blood, this, your saying, is no small derogation to baptism, wherein we receive not only the spirit of Christ, but also *Christ himself, whole body and soul, manhood and Godhead unto everlasting life, as well as in the holy communion.*" These words are often triumphantly quoted in proof of Cranmer's high estimate of the great effects of baptism, but it is necessary that we read the very next paragraph, in which the argument is continued, and in which he shows that in like manner we partake of Christ through other means. He here shows his opinion of the disputed 6th chapter of St. John. "But your understanding (that of Gardiner) of the 6th chapter of St. John, is such as was never uttered of any man before your time, and as declareth you to be utterly ignorant of God's mysteries. For who ever said or taught, before this time, that the sacrament was the cause why Christ said 'if we eat not the flesh of the Son of man, we have not life in us.' The spiritual eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood *by faith, by digesting his death in our minds*, as our only price, or ransom, and redemption from eternal damnation, is the cause why Christ said 'that if we eat not his flesh and drink not his blood, we have not life in us; and if we eat his flesh and drink his blood we have everlasting life.' And if Christ had never ordained the sacrament, yet

should we have eaten his flesh and drunken his blood, and have had thereby everlasting life; as all the faithful did before the sacrament was ordained, and do daily when they receive not the sacrament. And so did the holy men that wandered in the wilderness, and in all their lifetime very seldom received the sacrament; and many holy martyrs, either exiled or kept in prison, did daily feed on the food of Christ's body, and *drank daily of the blood that sprang out of his side*, or else they could not have had everlasting life, as Christ himself said in the Gospel of St. John, and yet they were not suffered with other christian people to have the use of the sacrament."*

I will now adduce another specimen of similarity of language, between Cranmer and those who are writing about "our regenerate humanity," "redeemed humanity," "our humanity being taken into Christ" by and at his birth, and being communicated in a purified state to each one through baptism, as if our whole nature of body and soul received some healing virtue from the body and human nature of Christ, as the diseased woman found virtue issuing from the touch of his garment. Cranmer, in his disputations at Oxford, did say, "That Christ dwelleth in us carnally and naturally, for that he hath taken of the Virgin our flesh upon him, and because he hath communicated his nature unto us." P. 410. Again, "We have fellowship with Christ, when we are united in the unity of the Church, when we are made flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone; and so we are united in the communion, in baptism, in faith." This giving to us his nature, and dwelling naturally in us, Cranmer explains in the course of the argument to be *the giving to us of his immortality.* He has the same more fully in his controversy with Gardiner, pages 164–'5–'6. "And yet, furthermore, when Hilary saith that we be naturally in Christ, he meaneth not that our bodies be contained within the compass of his body, but that we receive *his natural eternity.* And so when he saith that Christ dwelleth carnally and naturally in us, he meaneth not that his body is contained corporeally within the compass of our mouths and bodies, but he meaneth that Christ communicateth and giveth unto us of his eternity or everlasting life." "And as he may be said to dwell in us by receiving our mortal nature, so we may be said to dwell in him by receiving the nature of his immortality." While the Reformers and Fathers most zealously maintain the perfect humanity of Christ, and the incarnation of very God in very man, and the unspeak-

---

*Our church also holds the same doctrine as to the sick who cannot obtain the supper. See Rubric, after the administration of the supper to the sick.

able benefits thereof to man, they are not insensible to the danger of an undue and unscriptural devotion to the humanity of Christ, leading to the partial neglect of his divinity, and of the other persons of the Trinity in the economy of man's redemption. Wherefore, we find Cranmer, p. 330, thus speaking, "And St. Augustine was afraid, lest in worshipping Christ's very body we should offend; and therefore he biddeth us, when we worship Christ, that we should not tarry and fix our minds on his flesh, which of itself availeth nothing, but that we should lift up our minds from the flesh to the spirit, which giveth life; and yet the Papists be not afraid by crafty means to induce us to worship those things which be signs and sacraments of Christ's body." (*p*) Cranmer, here as else-

---

(*p*) Bishop Burnet, on the second article says, "That his human nature cannot be worshipped; therefore there must be another nature in him, to which divine worship is due, and on the account of which he is worshipped."

Mr. Wilberforce says, that "even in his humanity he was an object of worship to the hosts of heaven;" that "there was conferred as a gift upon the man Christ Jesus that quickening power which pertained to his Godhead by nature." Therefore he applies to him as man that which is said of the eternal Son of God: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." "Thus was there bestowed on *what was human* in him such living energy, as was evidenced while he was upon earth, when 'there went virtue out of him and healed them all.' So that *it* (what was human) became that quickening spirit, which is able to bestow a new life on the progeny of Adam." "Thus has the one nature received by gift what the other received by inheritance." Although Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges that those divine powers are not given in their infinity to the human nature of Christ, infinity only belonging to him as God, yet does he speak differently on the subject from the writers and authorities of the Reformation. In Bishop Jewell's controversy with Harding, when treating of the adoration of Christ, we have a reference to some difference among the Reformers, in language at least; some (as Luther) seeming to object to any adoration of Christ's humanity, even if it were actually present in the supper. Mr. Jewell says, "It is true that Christ's body and his godhead are joined inseparably, and therefore must be adored both together." "As the body and soul of man, being joined both in one, are honored both together, so must the humanity and divinity of Christ, being joined both in one, likewise be honored both together." But he says: "The one finite; the other infinite; the one in place; the other incomprehensible without place: the one a creature; the other a creator. Neither is there any godly honor due unto the body of Christ, in respect of itself; but only for that it is joined in one person with the divinity." He says we should adore him as St. Stephen did when he saw him at God's right hand. So careful are the Reformers not to use language which might even seem to suppose the humanity of Christ invested with attributes which might make it in itself an object of adoration. Well might they fear, that since it is finite if adoration were allowed to it because of any power given, by which it had life in itself, and could bestow life, that as adoration is due only to God, it might interfere with the claims of Deity, and might lead also to the worship of angels, however inferior they might be to the exalted and glorified Son of Man.

where, refers also to Christ's warning in the 6th of St. John, saying, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Such warnings are needful at this time, in regard to those who seem disposed to magnify material, external, and sacramental things unduly.

We shall now proceed to show by some extracts from Cranmer and from the Fathers, as adduced by him, what they understood by participating of Christ—having his presence—eating and drinking his body and blood, and becoming bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. We shall find, indeed, that they are guilty of what Mr. Wilberforce and those of his school call rationalistic theology, sometimes in a high degree, but which nevertheless will recommend itself to the pious, practical, and sober-minded as accordant with God's word and their own inward experience and outward observation. At p. 11, we have the following distinction between a bare or naked sign or token and an effectual one. In speaking of the sacraments he says: "And they be no vain or bare tokens as you would persuade, (for a bare token is that which betokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire which giveth neither light nor heat;) but in the due administration of the sacraments God is present, working with his word and sacraments." "And, therefore, you gather of my sayings unjustly, that Christ is indeed absent, for I say (according to God's word and the doctrine of the old writers) that Christ is present in his sacraments, as they teach also that he is present in his word, when he worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers. By which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporeally present in the voice or sound of the speaker, (which would perish as soon as the words be spoken,) but this speech meaneth that he worketh with his word, using the voice of the speaker as his instrument to work by; as he useth also his sacraments, whereby he worketh and therefore is said to be present in them."

On p. 27, he affirms that Augustine taught that the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood was "the chewing and digesting to our great consolation and profit that Christ died for us."

P. 41. "For as the word of God preached, putteth Christ into our ears, so likewise those elements of water, bread, and wine, joined to

---

Mr. Calfhill, in his work on the adoration of the Cross, quotes St. Chrysostom as saying that "to adore and worship, belongeth to a creature; but to be adored, belongeth to no creature, but only to the Lord." He quotes St. Cyril also, saying, "No man is ignorant that adoration in the Scripture is attributed to no kind of nature, save only to the nature of God." "Thus," adds Mr. Calfhill, "the elder Fathers."

God's word, do, after a sacramental manner, put Christ into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses."

P. 74, he says, that "as God's word to some is life, to some it is death and a snare, as the Prophet saith;" "so is the water in baptism and the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, to the worthy receiver, Christ himself, and eternal life, and to the unworthy receiver everlasting death and damnation, not by conversion of one substance into another, but by the godly or ungodly use thereof. And, therefore, in the book of the holy communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that *unto us* in that holy mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished. And a like prayer of old time were all the people wont to make at the communion, of all such offerings, as at that time all the people used to offer, praying that *their offerings might be unto them the body and blood of Christ.*"

On p. 91, we have an allusion to a comparison made by some of the Reformers (the strongest ever used by them) between Christ's body or human nature as being only in heaven, and the sun as being in the firmament. As the eyes of our bodies by looking up behold the beams of the sun, and our bodies by being exposed to it feel the heat thereof, though the sun be still afar off, so the eyes of our minds, the affections of our hearts, being lifted up to Christ in heaven by faith and love, are nourished by the thoughts of Christ who died for us, and is now interceding for us at God's right hand. Bishop Gardiner having quoted Bucer on this subject, Cranmer replied: "And now Master Bucer help this man at need; for he that hath ever cried out against you, now being at a pinch, driven to his shifts, crieth for help upon you; and although he was never your friend, yet extend your charity to help him in his necessity. But Master Bucer saith not as much as you do: and yet if you both said that the beams of the sun be of the same substance with the sun, who would believe either of you both? Is the light of the candle the substance of the candle; or the light of the fire the substance of the fire; or is the beams of the sun any thing but the clear light of the sun?"

On p. 95, we have this sentiment: "And again St. Augustine writeth upon the Gospel of St. John, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, is above, but his truth is here. His body, wherein he arose, is in one place, but his truth is spread everywhere."

P. 115. We have another quotation from St. Augustine: "Now this

saying of Christ, except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood you shall have no life in you, seemeth to command a heinous and wicked thing; therefore it is a figure, commanding us to be partakers of Christ's passion, *keeping in our minds to our great comfort and profit*, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us." This, saith St. Augustine, is to eat his flesh and drink his blood."

On p. 141 Cranmer says, "I grant that Christ is really not only in those that *duly* receive the Lord's Supper, but also in those that duly receive the sacrament of baptism, and in all other true christian people at other times when they receive no sacrament."

On p. 156 he quotes Origen as declaring "one manner of giving of Christ to us in his word, in baptism, and in the Lord's Supper." On pp. 207–'8 we have the following (as some would say most rationalistic) explanation of the manner of partaking of Christ's body and blood: "And every good and faithful christian man feeleth in himself how he feedeth of Christ, eating his flesh and drinking his blood. For he putteth the whole hope and trust of his redemption and salvation in that only sacrifice which Christ made upon the cross, having his body there broken, and his blood there shed, for the remission of his sins. And this great benefit of Christ, the faithful man earnestly considereth in his mind, cheweth and digesteth it with the stomach of his heart, spiritually receiving Christ wholly unto him, and giving again himself wholly unto Christ." In the same place on p. 209 he quotes Cyprian as saying, that "the eating is our dwelling in him, and our drinking is, as it were, an incorporation in him, being subject unto him in obedience, joined unto him in our wills, and united in our affections. The eating therefore of this flesh, he says, is a certain hunger and desire to dwell in him."

I shall only add, that Cranmer, with all the reformers, continually quote St. Augustine's words, "believe and thou hast eaten," in proof of their doctrine on this subject.

X.

EXTRACTS FROM JEWELL'S DEFENCE OF HIS APOLOGY FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

On p. 252, Parker Library, Jewell says, "and although the majesty and Godhead of Christ be everywhere abundantly dispersed, yet we believe that his body, as Augustine saith, "must needs be in one place." And, as the martyr Virgilius saith, that "Christ hath left us as touching his human nature, but hath not left us as touching his divine nature."

He quotes Origen also, p. 258: "It is not Christ, as being man, that is 'wheresoever two or three be gathered together in his name,' nor Christ as man is with us all days to the world's end, nor Christ as being man is present with the faithful every where gathered together, but that divine power or nature that was in Christ." "And for that same cause St. Augustine saith 'see you Christ ascending into heaven; believe in him being absent; trust in Christ that is to come; and yet by his secret mercy feel him present.'" And again, "Christ Jesus is every where and in all places by way of his Godhead, and in heaven by way of his manhood."

In opposition to the doctrine of Mr. Harding, that the Protestant doctrine of partaking of Christ was a mere fancy, he says with St. Paul, that "faith is the substance and ground of the things we hope for," and quotes St. Augustine, saying "send up thy faith and thou holdest Christ." He quotes Hierome, saying "Christ is thy banquet; Christ is thy thought; Christ is thy joy; Christ is thy reading; Christ is thy rest." Also to Ambrose, saying "in your minds Christ is daily offered up for the redemption of the body." On p. 485 he quotes Augustine as saying, "according to the presence of the flesh it is true that Christ said to his disciples 'me ye shall not have always with you.'" Origen also is quoted as saying "Christ, according to his Godhead, is not a stranger to us, but he is a stranger according to the dispensation of the body that he received." He quotes Tertullian as saying "Christ must be devoured by hearing, chewed by understanding, digested by faith." Origen as saying "the blood of Christ is poured into our hearts;" Cyprian that "the eating of his flesh is a certain greediness and a certain desire to tarry in Christ;" Gratian as saying "touching these words 'the truth of Christ's flesh and blood' some men not unaptly understand thereby, the effect and force of Christ's flesh and blood—that is to say—the remission of our sins."

On p. 494 we have some further testimonies of the Fathers. "It appeareth, saith Jewell, by the witness of the ancient learned Doctors and Fathers, that we are really and corporeally joined and united unto Christ, not only by the mysteries of the holy supper, but also by faith, by baptism, by the Spirit of God, by love, and other ways." St. Augustine says "by faith we are incorporate in Christ Jesus our Lord." Again, "he that cometh unto me is incorporate into me." St. Chrysostom, "what will not Christ be unto us? For by all manner of means he cleaveth and fasteneth himself unto us." Again, "thou embraceth the Lord himself, and art mingled with him, and being here beneath, art

joined to that body that sitteth above." St. Hierome, "we are of his flesh and of his bones, for that he is the head of his body which is the Church." Jewell, however, shows how the Fathers are continually qualifying and explaining their strong figurative expressions by such terms as these—as it were—after a sort—if I may so speak. In the following passages indeed all figure is laid aside. On p. 496 St. Cyprian is quoted as saying "the conjunction that is between us and Christ neither mingleth persons, nor uniteth substances, but joineth affections and knitteth wills." St. Cyril, "the beginning and foundation of our holiness is Christ—by faith I mean, and none otherwise, for in this sort Christ dwelleth in us." Chrysostom, "Christ by unspeakable means began to be nearer to us by his divinity, the further he is made from us by his humanity."

Mr. Jewell makes good use of that part of the ancient communion service which we still use, but which he charges the Church of Rome with laying aside, wherein the minister calls on the people to lift up their hearts, and they reply "we lift them up unto the Lord." He quotes from Cyprian and Augustine to show that these words were designed to teach the people to go up to heaven in search of Christ, sitting at the right hand of God. He charges the Romanists with understanding the words *sursum corda* to mean *look downwards*.

PASSAGES FROM JEWELL'S CONTROVERSY WITH HARDING ON THE REAL PRESENCE. PARKER LIBRARY.

Page 449: But our doctrine is grounded upon God's holy word, that as certainly as Christ gave His body on the cross, so certainly He giveth now the self same body to the faithful; and that, not only in the ministration of the sacrament, as Mr. Harding untruly imagineth, but also at all times whensoever we be able to say with Paul, "I think I know nothing but Jesus Christ, and the same Christ crucified on the cross." Again, he says that St. Augustine declares "that Abraham, Moses, Aaron, and others, received the body of Christ, truly and effectually, long time before that Christ either had received flesh of the Virgin Mary, or had ordained the sacrament."

Mr. Jewell also quotes various Fathers to show that the eating of Christ's flesh, mentioned in the 6th chapter of St. John, did not refer to the Lord's Supper, but to that partaking of Christ by faith, which the true believers always have.

On page 462 he quotes, from Augustine and Clemens Alexandrinus, some expressions about the "sacred Scriptures making us Gods;" adding,

that they only meant that "men are endued with godly virtues and qualities." St. Peter, in like manner, speaks of God's promises, by which we become partakers of the divine nature.

On page 475, Gregory Nyssen is quoted as saying that Christ is not only made bread to us, but "whatsoever thing is convenient for the receiver, into the same thing Christ turneth himself. He becometh strong meat unto the perfect, herbs unto the weaker, and milk unto children." And, so far from receiving Christ's body only in the sacrament, he says, "whoso hath abundantly drunken of the Apostles' springs, (their writings,) hath already received whole Christ."

We only add, that Mr. Jewell frequently speaks of the language of some of the Fathers as being highly figurative, and altogether beyond common sense and fact, unless so understood.

XI.

THE FOLLOWING QUOTATIONS FROM COVERDALE, HUTCHINSON, AND BRADFORD, ARE TAKEN FROM THE VOLUMES OF THE PARKER LIBRARY, CONTAINING THEIR WRITINGS.

Bishop Coverdale, page 71: "The natural Son of God himself, from heaven, became a mortal man, to the intent that man's mortal nature, through the uniting thereof with the immortal nature of the Godhead in his own very person, might be exalted to an immortal life."

Roger Hutchinson, page 245: "Here a question may be demanded—no less necessary to be known than hard to dissolve and answer—if Christ's flesh be eat only by faith, how is that true which I rehearsed out of Chrysostom, that we are transformed into Christ and made His body, *non solum per fidem*, not only by faith, *sed re ipsa*, but also really, truly, and effectually. You shall understand, well beloved in the Lord, that when we receive Christ in faith, that this receipt joineth and coupleth us really and effectually to Christ. Not only our hearts and minds, but also our bodies and flesh be purified, be washed, be cleansed, by this receipt; so that Christ, our head and Lord, dwelleth and abideth in us hereby, and nourisheth and feedeth us continually *with faith in His blood, and with the comfort of His Holy Spirit, making us lively, holy, and very members of His mystical body.* This is the effect and meaning of Chrysostom, in which he affirmeth that we are made the body of Christ really, truly, and effectually."

Again, page 262–'3: "To eat Christ's flesh and to drink His blood, is to believe that the Son of God, concerning His humanity and flesh,

was nailed on the cross, and that His blood was let forth for the expiation of our sins, and for our redemption and righteousness, and to repose (restore) us again into God's favor. And this spiritual receipt, which is by faith, is so effectual and of so mighty and so vehement an operation, that as matrimony maketh man and wife one flesh, according as it is written, *erant duo in carne una*, so it joineth us unto Christ *re ipsa*, that is really, truly, and effectually, making us flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone—that is lively, holy, and very members of His mystical body."

What is to be understood by this comparison of the union between believers and Christ with the conjunction between the man and his wife, may be seen from the following quotation from Bradford, another of the martyr reformers:

Extract from Bradford on the Lord's Supper, page 99: "Alas that men consider nothing at all, how the coupling of Christ's body and blood to the sacrament is a spiritual thing; and therefore there needs no such carnal presence as the Papists imagine. Who will deny a man's wife to be with her husband one body and flesh, although she be at London and her husband at York? But the Papists are animal men, and guided by carnal reason only, or else they would know how that the Holy Ghost because of our infirmity useth metaphorically the words of abiding, dwelling, eating and drinking of Christ, that the unspeakable conjunction of Christ with us might be something known."

The following is his comparative view of the Word and sacraments: "Again, though in the field a man may receive Christ's body by faith, in the meditation of his word, yet deny I that a man doth ordinarily receive Christ's body, by the only meditation of Christ's death or hearing of his word with so much light, and by such sensible assurance (whereof God knoweth our infirmity hath no small need) as by the receipt of the sacrament. Not that Christ is not so much present in his word preached, as he is in or with the sacrament, but because there is in the perception of the sacrament more windows open for Christ to enter into us than by his word preached or heard. For there (I mean in the Word) he hath an entrance into our hearts, but only by the ear, through the voice and sound of the words; but here through the sacrament he hath an entrance by all our senses, by our eyes, by our nose, by our taste, and by our handling also."

XII.

EXTRACTS FROM KING EDWARD'S CATECHISM AND NOWELL'S CATECHISM.

To these testimonies of individuals among the reformers we add a few extracts from two catechisms, the one put forth in the time of Edward the 6th, and called King Edward's Catechism, and the other in the reign of Elizabeth, called Nowell's Catechism. Of the former Dr. Randolph, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, and then of London, and who published them both for the students of divinity at Oxford, says "that it was the last work of the reformers in that reign; whence it may be fairly understood to contain, as far as it goes. their ultimate decision, and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established." "In this, he says, according to Archbishop Wake, the complete model of our church catechism was laid." As to the latter—Nowell's Catechism—it was prepared, says Strype, especially for the "youth of the gentry, and such as were designed for divinity." It was examined first by four bishops, then reviewed and approved by both houses of Convocation, then by learned men according to the direction of Secretary Cecil. "So carefully and exactly, says Strype, was it reviewed and corrected, to make it a standing summary of the doctrines of the church."

From the first—King Edward's primer—we quote as follows:

Of sacraments it is said—"They are certain customable reverent doings and ceremonies ordained by Christ; that by them he might put us in remembrance of his benefits, and we might declare our profession." Of baptism it says, it represents and sets before our eyes "that we are by the Spirit of Christ new born and cleansed from sin, that we be members and parts of his church, received into communion of saints." These are the strongest expressions used as to the sacrament of baptism, and how different from those now in use which represent us as thereby becoming partakers of "Christ's regenerate humanity," being taken "into Christ's sanctified manhood," and by this means only readmitted to the divine presence and favor.

From Nowell's Catechism we quote as follows. Instead of beginning with the sacraments as our first and only means of union with Christ's humanity, as some now speak, it says, "now having ended our treating of the law of God, of the creed or christian confession, and also of prayer and thanksgiving, (on all which topics it had largely discoursed,) it resteth *last of all* that we speak of the sacraments or divine mysteries,

which alway have prayer and thanksgiving joined unto them." It declares a sacrament to be an "outward testifying of God's good will and bountifulness towards us, through Christ, by a visible sign representing an invisible and spiritual grace, by which the promises of God touching forgiveness of sins, and eternal salvation given through Christ, are, as it were, sealed, and the truth of them is more certainly confirmed in our hearts." It declares that the "force and efficacy of the sacraments" "wholly floweth from *the Spirit of God* (not the sanctified manhood of Christ) *as out of a springhead*, and is by the divine mysteries, which are ordained by the Lord for this end, conveyed unto us."

In answer to the question whence have we regeneration, it does not say, we are first regenerated in the mass, by Christ's incarnation in the womb of the virgin, and each one by baptism when we are taken into Christ's manhood, but says we have regeneration "none other ways but from the death and resurrection of Christ. For by the force of Christ's death our old man is, after a certain manner, crucified and mortified, and the corruptness of our nature is as it were buried, that it no more live and be strong in us. And by the special mean of his resurrection, he giveth us grace to be newly formed unto a new life, to obey the righteousness of God." The whole catechism, as far as it relates to the word and sacraments as means of grace, is as different from the works of Mr. W., as the two opposite schools to which the authors belong.

It is not wonderful therefore that Mr. W. should deal so largely in quotations from the figurative illustrations of the early Fathers, from the writings of the Romish schoolmen, the divines of Laudian tendency, and should so fully adopt the style and sentiments of the Tractarians, though he is careful not to quote them, while he avoids the authority and language of the reformers.

XIII.

TYNDAL AND PETER MARTYR.

The doctrine of Cranmer, Ridley, and others, as to the word and sacraments, had been held and taught by the martyr Tindal, author of a version of the Bible into English, many years before. He was executed in the year 1536.

Speaking of the extravagant estimate of ordinances at that time, he says, "They think that the work maketh safe," "the very plunging into water saveth them." But he quotes St. Peter as saying, "Of his own good will begat he us with the word of life, that is, the word of

promise:" Again, "Ye are born anew not of mortal seed, but immortal, by the Word of God." "The sacraments which Christ ordained—he says—preach God's Word to us, and, *therefore, justify and minister the Spirit to those that believe,* as Paul through preaching the Gospel was a minister of righteousness, and the spirit, to all that believed his preaching."

On the subject of the real and universal presence of Christ's humanity he speaks thus: "But Christ (say they) is very God, and hath power to make his body to be *every thing and every where.* I answer, that God cannot make every of his creatures God too; neither can it be proved less repugnant, that a creature should be every where, than that he should be God."

The testimony of Peter Martyr is clear and decisive, not merely as to his own opinion, but as to that of Cranmer, Ridley, and those concerned in drawing up the Prayer Book. From a letter recently discovered in the archives of Zurich, and published by Mr. Goode of London, it seems that there were some who differed from the leading Reformers, as to the sacraments, and still held to the Romish doctrine as to their virtue, though not as to the real presence in the Eucharist.

Of those who had the work in hand, Peter Martyr says, "They make it a primary point to endeavor in all ways to show, that nothing more is to be granted to the sacraments than to the external word of God, for by both these kinds of word is signified and shewed to us the salvation obtained for us through Christ, which as many are made partakers of *as believe these words and signs,* not indeed by virtue of the words or of the sacrament, but *by the efficacy of faith.*" "And as the external words of God avail *to the quickening and exciting our faith* which is often torpid, and in a measure laid asleep in us, this same thing also the sacraments can effect by the power of the Holy Spirit, and their use is of no little benefit *to confirm our minds,* otherwise weak, concerning the promises and grace of God." As to children, instead of their being taken into Christ's humanity and regenerated through the agency of baptism, he says it was held "that pardon of original sin, reconciliation with God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, bestowed on them through Christ, is sealed in them, and that those *belonging already to the Church are also visibly implanted in it.*" Children were considered as already the objects of God's favor, and belonging to the Church, though not assured of it by the seal of baptism, or visibly grafted into the Church.

With this statement, the articles which were for a time delayed by reason of the controversy, but which were adopted a few months afterwards, entirely agree.

XIV.

THE PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS, BINGHAM AND WALL.

The author of this Review, in order to be the more confident of the correctness of the charge against Mr. Wilberforce and his school, of adopting a new phraseology, which must, in some measure, declare a new theology on the subject treated of, has read over the confessions of all the Prostestant churches as seen in the harmony thereof, and finds himself in all of them under another kind of teaching.

He has also read over what the learned Bingham has written on the subject of the opinions of the ancients. But Mr. Bingham, though not disposed to make light of baptism, or explain away the doctrine of the ancients, but the very contrary, yet, by comparing together their expressions concerning the same, presents a general view of the subject quite different from that of Mr. Wilberforce.

But by far the fullest and most learned work on Baptism and its effects, is that of Mr. Wall, in two large volumes, in which the history of baptism, especially of infants, from the earliest records of the christian church to his own times, is drawn from the writings of those who carried on discussions of the subject. Nor was Mr. Wall disposed to undervalue it, but, on the contrary, was under a strong temptation to magnify its effects as much as possible, and represent the early Christians as ascribing great efficiency to it, since thereby he promoted his great object, the establishment of the fact of infant baptism in their day. It may be well to give a condensed view of his historical sketch. He proves from Jewish writers that the term regeneration did not begin to be used by our Lord, but was applied to those who became converts to Judaism, and were said to be *baptized into Moses*—that is, into the Jewish church. We look in vain through these volumes for the Tractarian doctrine, that baptism is an extension of the incarnation, that Christ's humanity is the source of all graces to the Christian. If an expression occurs savoring of this, it is some figurative one, *some elegant opinion*, as Bishop Taylor says, which is an exception to the general rule. And yet there are many extravagant things spoken about baptism, many attempts to be wise above what is written, many positive dogmatic assertions, for which none could plead "Thus saith the Lord." A large part of Mr. Wall's volumes consists in quotations from St. Augustine, who wrote many volumes on the subject of original sin in opposition to Pelagius, who denied it, and maintained that the grace of God and re-

demption was not needed for the pardon and doing away of that, but only for our actual sins, which, however, he maintained began with the very cries and fretfulness of children. St. Austin maintained that we all sinned in Adam's sin, and derived an evil nature from him. Beside adducing Scripture and fact in proof of this, he appealed to, and dwelt much on the fact of infant baptism, which he maintained would not have been enjoined, unless we brought an evil nature with us into the world, requiring to be met with some remedy at once. Of course, he was under every temptation to make the greatest use of the sentiments of all who had gone before him in favor of its object and efficacy, and to take the highest ground himself as to its indispensable necessity to the removal of original sin.

Wherefore, we find him and his admiring followers declaring in the strongest terms their belief, that with a very few exceptions, such as martyrs, neither unbaptized adults or children could be saved. Even Pelagius, though denying the necessity of baptism for the removal of original sin, yet said it was necessary in order to admission to Heaven, as infants began to sin as soon as born, and declared that to such as died unbaptized would be assigned some third place; that Heaven would be lost to them, though they would be spared the pains of hell. St. Austin denied that the Scripture recognised any such place; and yet, strange to say, in the course of the argument, when pressed with the objections to so many infants being lost through no fault of their own, and because their parents did not bring them to baptism, he declared his belief, that unbaptized infants dying in infancy, and adults who were pious, but for various reasons were not baptized, would, though not admitted into Heaven, and though cast down into hell, be in a better condition than if they had never been born, and have more positive enjoyment in hell, than they would in Pelagius's third place. Strange doctrine, this; but the doctrine of St. Austin and his disciples. St. Austin, in defending his doctrine against Pelagius, resorted much to another doctrine, which, whether in Scripture or not, had been but little, if at all, agitated before his time. He appealed to the doctrine of eternal election, in opposition to Pelagius, who maintained that man was born free from original sin, and with sufficient power, by the help of that ordinary grace vouchsafed to all men, to work out their own salvation. St. Austin maintained that only the elect from all eternity received that grace; that all others would fail and must forever perish. A certain kind of regeneration he assigned to the baptism of all infants, but distinguished it from the conversion of the heart, which was necessary to salvation; nor could that regeneration

ever avail any thing unless there was election. He also maintained that every baptized infant dying in infancy would certainly be saved, for that God took care that all his elect children should be brought to baptism, and of course those who were not brought were the non-elect, and would never enter the kingdom of heaven, though they would have so much enjoyment in hell, as to prefer existence there to annihilation. (*q*) After Pelagius and his party had been put down, there arose a sect called Semipelagians who adopted a part of his system. I will give the difference between them and St. Augustin in Mr. Wall's words: "The difference between them as to the case of infants dying in infancy was this: St. Austin and his followers held that God, by his *mere gratuitous pleasure*, does ordain that such or such infants shall come to have baptism, and so be saved, and others shall miss of it; without any regard to the qualifications which they would have had if they had lived. But the Semipelagians (so called) said that such infants as God foreknew would have been faithful Christians, if they had lived, those

---

(*q*) It deserves to be mentioned, that Augustine also maintained, with many others, that the receiving of the Eucharist was necessary to the salvation of an infant. Mr. Wall says, that he repeats this eight or ten times, in several places of his books, and that he appeals to the 6th chapter of John in proof of it, saying that eternal life is not to be hoped for without baptism and the body and blood of our Lord, that "it is in vain promised to infants without them." See vol. 2, p. 439 and onwards. It is also a fact, that there were those who held that both baptism and the supper should be administered to the dead. It was held and practised to such an extent, that Fathers wrote against it, and councils passed laws against it. To the dead who were baptized, sponsors were appointed, who answered in their names. The Apostle Paul was adduced as authority, because he said, "why then are ye baptized for the dead." Of course, we do not mean that St. Austin advocated this superstition.

We certainly may be allowed to take the liberty which Augustine grants us, as to his writings, in the following passage:

"Trust not me, nor credit my writings, as if they were the canonical scripture; but whatsoever thou findest in the word, although thou didst not believe it before, yet ground thy faith on it now; and whatsoever thou readest of mine, unless thou knowest it certainly to be true, give thou no certain assent to it."

St. Basil, also, speaking of the respect due to the writings of the Fathers, "we must be partakers of other men's sayings only after the manner of the bees. For they flee not alike unto all flowers; nor where they sit, they crop them quite away; but snatching as much as shall suffice for their honey making, take their leave of the rest. Even so, we, if we be wise, having got of others as much as is sound, and agreeable to truth, will leap over the rest."

"Chrysostom, says one of the reformers, was not without his faults. His golden mouth wherein he passed (excelled) others, sometimes had leaden words." The foregoing quotations are from Calfhill's work on the Cross, Parker Library.

he by his providence procured to be baptized; and suffered others to miss it." May we not ask where does God's word say, or intimate, to us any thing on this distressing subject; and what confidence are we called on to place in the mere surmises of uninspired men, when engaged in controversy, and tempted to make them, in order to support a theory?

And yet there have been many who have received their determinations concerning such things, as though they were not the secret things which belong to God, but the revealed doctrines of the Bible, written as with a sunbeam. Even so late as the year 1536, when the first set of articles were drawn up by Cranmer, in the reign of Henry the 8th, it was affirmed not only that all baptized children would certainly be saved, but that the unbaptized would not. But Cranmer and his fellow reformers lived to think otherwise, and in the articles subsequently adopted they struck out the foregoing, and in its room substituted that wise declaration which is to be found, almost word for word, in some of the continental confessions, "that the baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

To return to Mr. Wall. Notwithstanding all the strong expressions of many of the ancients as to the effects of baptism on infants, and its indispensable necessity to their salvation, Mr. Wall, in summing up the whole matter, and giving us the amount of their belief, says "Not that God, by any miracle at that time, illuminates or converts the mind of the child. And for original sin, or the corruption of nature, they hold that God, *by his covenant,* does abolish the guilt of it, receives the child to his mercy in Christ, and consigns to him by promise such grace as shall afterward, by the use of means, if he live, be sufficient to keep it under, but not wholly extirpate it in this life. It is left as a subject of trial, and of a continual Christian warfare. *And this is the opinion of St. Austin, and of the ancients in general.*" Surely, the positive engrafting of each child into the purified human nature of Christ by the Spirit in the waters of baptism, effecting a new birth to a new nature and life, just as certainly as Christ assumed a purified human nature in the womb of the virgin, is different from the above.

There is a passage in the close of his work where he beseeches the Baptists in England not to break fellowship for the sake of a controverted opinion, which deserves to be introduced: "The ancient and primitive Christians, for certain, did not reckon this point among the fundamental ones; for they drew up short draughts and summaries of

the faith, which we call creeds, and into them they put all those articles which they thought fundamental or absolutely necessary. Now, though some Churches had their creeds a little longer than others, and some councils or meetings of Christians did over do, in putting some opinions which they valued more than need was, into their creeds, yet there never was any creed at all that had this article in it, *either that infants be baptized, or that only adult persons are to be baptized. Baptism itself does make an article in some of the old creeds.* As for example, in the Constantinopolitan, which is now received in all Christendom: "I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins." In examining the creeds of the primitive Church, as seen in Bingham, it appears that the first appearance of baptism in a creed was in one of doubtful date and authorship, and found in what are called the apostolic constitutions, and supposed by Bingham to be written in the latter end of the third century, in which the person using it says, that he is baptized *not into Christ or his human nature*, as Mr. Wilberforce would have it, *but "in the Father, in the Son, and into the Holy Ghost."* In the Nicene creed, as first adopted by the great council of Nice, baptism is not mentioned. It was not until the year 386, when it was completed at Constantinople that the clause "one Baptism for the remission of sins" was introduced. This shows that they did not consider it as a fundamental article of *the faith*, absolutely necessary to salvation, as the existence of the Trinity, the incarnation, birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, forgiveness of sins, resurrection of the dead, and the life everlasting. Without these things of course there can be no salvation. But baptism is not a divine reality as they are, without which there is no religion, no salvation, but only one of the means God has appointed to aid us in deriving virtue from those great facts and realities. While they cannot in any case be dispensed with, this can, from the very nature thereof, and sometimes is, as all are forced to acknowledge. Wherefore to this day it is not introduced into the apostles' creed, among the great facts or objective truths of our religion.

XV.

DOCTRINE OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

The doctrine of Christ's human nature being the ever present source and foundation of all grace and gifts to the Church, and the mere extension of the Incarnation, if in the Prayer Book, is held in deep reserve and carefully concealed from us. Let any one, after reading Mr. Wilber-

force's book, or any thing of the same kind, then take up the Prayer Book, and go through all its prayers, creeds, and offices, and see if he is not reading another speech or language. What is there in the creeds, in the doxologies, benediction, in the addresses to each person of the Trinity, in the prayers for all the graces of the Christian, which thus distinguishes and magnifies the humanity of Christ as the source of all good gifts? Almost all the prayers, whether in the morning or evening service, the offices, or the collects, do indeed conclude with Christ, who graciously enjoined that we ask the Father in His name. But what is meant by "through Christ?" Is it pleading the virtue and power of the ever present humanity of Christ as the source, or even channel, of heavenly gifts? Is it not rather pleading what He has done and suffered for us—His resurrection and ascension, and His intercession for us at God's right hand, as the Divine Mediator? How often is this shown by the variation and enlargement of the closing words? The Father is invoked and supplicated for His gifts, "for the sake of His Son," "through the merits of His Son," "the satisfaction of the Son," "the love of the Son," "the honor of our Advocate and Mediator." In the Litany, after enumerating all Christ did on earth, even to His ascension, then, instead of pleading any thing more that He was now doing in the body on earth, we say "and by the coming of the Holy Ghost," which was in place of His bodily presence. We pray to Almighty God, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, to be replenished with the Holy Ghost, not with the graces of Christ's body. We pray that "the Church may be governed by Thy good Spirit." We find nothing of Christ's body doing all these things by the power of the Holy Ghost, as though the body were the principal and the Spirit the instrument used. In the Collects for Advent, for Christmas day, for the circumcision of Christ, the annunciation of the Virgin Mary, for Christ's ascension, we surely might expect to have this great fact set forth in a plain and prominent manner, if the Church had viewed it in the light Mr. W. does. But, so far from this, the language leads the mind away from a present and mightily operative presence of Christ's human nature, to what He did while on earth and is doing in Heaven. Thus, in the Collects for the annunciation of the Virgin Mary, we pray "*that as we have known the incarnation* of thy Son Jesus Christ by the message of an Angel, so by *His cross and passion* we may be brought unto the glory of His resurrection." The Collect for Ascension day carries our minds upward to Christ, who ascended to heaven; "so may we, also, in heart and mind thither ascend, and with Him continually dwell." The ascension of Christ to the right hand of

the Father, and His coming again to judge the world, are facts constantly set forth in the Prayer book as in the Bible, while you look in vain for anything recognising His intermediate descent and dwelling among men, either in the actual flesh and blood He once had, or in any mysterious, invisible, but real human form differing from that. Nor can her silence be construed into consent to that doctrine. If Mr. W. be right, then have we a most rationalistic Liturgy; one very different from that which he would frame in order to give due prominence to the doctrine of Christ's "renewed and renewing manhood," so that all men might see it and feel it. It is not wonderful that some of the Tractarians should have exhibited such a hankering after the *richer services* of the Romish Church, and lamented the losses we have sustained by the change of the ritual at the reformation. In the Romish services there is, indeed, a constant reference to the ever present humanity of Christ in the Lord's Supper, since they believe that He is actually in the body which He had while on the earth, on the table and in the mouths and bodies of the communicants, although they see Him not and cannot feel Him as the disciples did. The Tractarian view of Christ's presence differs of course from this, but not more widely, we believe, than it does from that of the Reformers; and we have seen, and are continually seeing, how readily it (the Tractarian) slides into Romanism. It is very evident why some of those called Puseyites denounced Cranmer and others as *irreverent Reformers.* Had not this comparative view of the two systems been already so much extended, it might be useful to add some passages from the Homilies, a book recognised by the Articles as containing wholesome doctrine. The reader is again requested to examine such as touch on the points under consideration. For what is called the *Church system, the sacramental system, the only basis on which religious education can be successfully conducted,* he will look in vain through these faithful sermons of Cranmer and Jewell. So also, and with a determination to rest his decision on the result, let him take up the New Testament, where, if true, this system must be found. Let him compare such writings as those of Mr. Wilberforce with the Gospels and Epistles, and see whether they belong to the same school. Let him even dwell on such passages as those relied on for the support of the system we are considering, such as "being baptized into Christ," "baptized into his death," "putting on Christ," "being buried with him," "crucified with him," and "rising again with him," and "eating and drinking his body and blood." Let him understand these as they must be understood to sustain the doctrine of this school, making

as little allowance for figurative language, as its advocates do, and see to what he will be led in his interpretation of scripture. If he does not find himself landed in the bosom of the Romish Church, he will be forced in honor to disavow the Protestant, and seek shelter in that most undefined and undefinable thing called *Catholicity.*

XVI.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The history of God's Church furnishes abundant and melancholy proofs that his best gifts to man being misunderstood and perverted, become means of condemnation. His blessed Scriptures have often been wrested to the destruction of those unto whom they were designed to give life. Not one of its precious truths but has been so construed by some as to minister to vice and superstition. It is sad to think how this blessed doctrine of the Incarnation has thus been dealt with by man. Viewed in connection with his holy life, his atoning death, his mighty resurrection, glorious ascension, and perpetual intercession for us at God's right hand, his coming again to judge the world, and our everlasting enjoyment of his presence hereafter, it is unspeakably important; and yet how have effects been ascribed to it as a cause not to be found in Scripture, and what superstitions have been reared upon it as a fact? Instead of Christ's humbling himself to be born of a virgin, being the means of teaching us humility by showing us our wretched condition, that required such condescension on the part of God, a lesson of pride and self-righteousness has been drawn from it. Not only did the close contact of his humanity with the Virgin Mary lead to the belief of a most wonderful exaltation of her nature and person, until she came by degrees to be worshipped even more than the Son of God himself; but the belief that this his continued presence in that incarnate state, though invisible to us, has led to the greatest superstitions and abuses of which religion is capable. The continued intercourse with him by means of sacraments, in one of which he is believed to be not only actually present, *soul, body, and divinity,* but be taken into our hands, and put into our mouths, and made the food of body and soul, has led to the belief, that not merely the Virgin Mary was thus highly exalted by her contact with his body,*

* Not only was the body of Mary thus purified and exalted, and hereby deified, but the very cross on which our Lord was crucified came to be considered as having a divine and miraculous virtue imparted to it by the contact of Christ's body, so that centuries

but that we also may be; and that many are and have been by such participation, so elevated as to be capable of almost any achievements in holiness. Some have reached such heights that they have been enrolled as saints worthy of homage, prayed to as mighty intercessors with God, invoked as patrons to their admirers on earth. Miraculous powers have been ascribed to them not only since, but some times before their deaths. Their anniversaries have been celebrated, their praises sung in temples dedicated to them, and called after their names. (*r*) Nor only this, but immense numbers of lower note are yet supposed to attain greater heights of holiness than God requires, so that they can deposit the higher degrees thereof in the great reservoir, in which the Church keeps her stores of superfluous merit and works of supererogation to dispose of for her benefit, to the evil ones who have means to purchase what they need. Thus has been introduced into the Church of God a doctrine so contrary to that of the Saviour, who declared all to be unprofitable servants, that his Gospel becomes another gospel. The theory of human perfectibility, as held by some visionary philosophers, falls immensely below the doctrine of perfection and superfluous merit, by some who think that partaking continually of Christ himself in his regenerate humanity, they are even now almost as he is. Would it not be well for us to remember who it was that said to our first parents, "ye shall be as gods," and what was the effect of their hearkening to these words, and aspiring to such elevation? Would it not be well for us to remember that by means of pride and ambition angels lost their first estate, and are now sunk too deep in misery and vice ever to be restored? Let us be admonished by the past, of which we read in the history of God's Church, and the present which we see and know but too well, not to

---

after, when it was supposed to be found under the ruins of Jerusalem, pieces of the same were hung up in churches and elsewhere to be worshipped. And afterwards the very signs of this, whether in crucifixes or made by the finger in the air, or on the forehead, were used as having divine virtue in them. Tractarians speak of the "almost sacramental virtue of the sign of the cross. One of the Reformers, in arguing this point with the Romanists, said, "If ye will have us credit your doctrine, then let us see the proofs; let miracles be wrought; let the cross make you honest; and I verily will affirm it a miracle."

(*r*) From the Banner of the Cross, we take the following extract from the Mercersburg Review, a paper which sustains the views of Mr. Wilberforce: "It is notorious, that the Church, according to the universal sense of the ancient christian world was held to be the repository, actually, of superhuman powers among men; grace being lodged in its very constitution for the salvation of sinners." "Prophetical and priestly functions were felt to belong to it, as the body of Christ."

calculate on such immediate effects from the fact of Christ's incarnation upon us, and from the perpetual presence of his human nature in sacraments, or in any other way. Relying on the efficacy of an ever-present body, which is not promised, we may neglect to supplicate the aid of the Spirit which is promised; seeking the flesh which profiteth not, we may lose the Spirit which quickeneth. Let us seek the mind and the spirit of Christ in the diligent and prayerful study and use of that truth, of which men are born again, by which Christ prayed the Father to sanctify us, and we may by means of its many and precious promises become partakers of a divine nature, not of its essence and substance, but of its qualities, the fruits of the Spirit, so as to escape the corruption of the world. In the language of poetry we may say of this—

"Food on which mortals feeding turn to gods."

Of the interesting and all important facts of the incarnation and nativity we may make much good use, independent of their being indispensable to his life, death, and all else done for our salvation, without ascribing our regeneration and new birth unto their efficacious virtue. By meditating upon them as divine realities, bearing their part in the great work of our redemption, we may say with Madame Guyon, who, though a mystic, was not as the mystics of our day:

"The Lord of all things in his humble birth,
Makes mean the proud magnificence of earth;
The straw, the manger, and the mouldering wall,
Eclipse its lustre, and I scorn them all—
All, all have lost the charms they once possessed;
An infant God reigns sov'reign in my breast.
From Bethlehem's bosom I no more will rove,
There dwells the Saviour, and there rests my love.
Thou art my bliss, the light by which I move;
In thee alone dwells all that I can love.
For destitute of good and rich in ill,
Must be my state and my description still.
The more I feel my misery, I adore
The sacred inmate of my soul the more;
Rich in his love, I feel my noblest pride,
Spring from the sense of having nought beside."

But we must ever remember that we then only have realized the design, and felt the effects of Christ's incarnation, nativity, and all that he did, and is doing for us, when we can say with the apostle, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified to me, and I to the world."